DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 942 SP 021 492

AUTHOR McIntyre, D. John
TITLE Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-029-9
PUB DATE Feb 83
CONTRACT 400-78-0017
NOTE 60p.
AVAILABLE FROM Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; Program Effectiveness; Student Teacher Relationship; Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Educators; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Influence; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive analysis of literature on field experiences for the preservice teacher is divided into sections which focus on the: (1) influences of field experiences on the attitudes and behavior of preservice teachers; (2) roles of university student teacher supervisors and cooperating teachers; (3) structure of field experience programs and models; (4) evaluation of student teacher performance during field experience; and (5) assessment of the success of field experiences. A summary section includes the conclusion that field experience in teacher education is threatened by "the lack of commitment by higher education, the low status of clinical faculty, the lack of objective evaluation criteria, the loss of control to teacher unions and state legislatures, and the lack of relationship between field and campus study." In addition to 11 recommendations for improving field programs, descriptions of 17 exemplary field experience programs in the United States and Canada are appended, along with references. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225942

FIELD EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

FROM STUDENT TO TEACHER

by D. John McIntyre

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Published by the Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education
and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036

February 1983 Clearinghouse No. SP 021 492

SP 021 492

This and other publications may be ordered from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. A list is available on request.

The Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education is copublishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. This material does not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation or of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is funded by the National Institute of Education. The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to contract no. 400-78-0017 with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgments in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to external referees for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. However, points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent the official views or opinions of the National Institute of Education, the Clearinghouse, or the contracting agent, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 83-080040
ISBN 0-89333-029-9

CONTENTS

FOREWORD v

ABOUT ERIC vi

THE FOUNDATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION vii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

The Field Experience: An Introduction 1

The Influence of Field Experiences 3
Stages of Student Teaching 3
The Role of Interpersonal Relationships 4
Attitude Changes 7
Socialization Process 8

The Role of Clinical Faculty 11
Models of the Classroom Teacher Educator 11
Perceptions of the Clinical Faculty Role 12
Perceptions of the Cooperating Teacher 13
Status of Clinical Faculty 14
Summary 15

Program Structures 16
Structural Models for Field Experiences 16
Early Field Experiences 18
Internships and Extended Programs 21

Evaluating the Student Teacher's Performance 23

Summary 26
The Field Experience as a Socializing Agent 26
Status of Clinical Faculty 27
Cooperating Teacher as Teacher Trainer 27
Control of Field Experiences 28
Environments 28
Early Field Experiences 28
Evaluating Students' Performance 28
Competent Teachers? 29
The Effectiveness of Field Experience Programs 29

Recommendations for Future Field Experience Programs 30

References 35

Appendix: Exemplary Field Experience Programs 45

FOREWORD

Most, if not all, teacher preparation programs offer some form of field experience for their students, but these field programs are not achieving their potential. That is John McIntyre's conclusion following a thorough review of the literature discussing the influence, the participants, and the structure of field programs.

In brief summary, field experiences in teacher education are threatened by "the lack of commitment by higher education, the low status of clinical faculty, the lack of objective evaluation criteria, the loss of control to teacher unions and state legislatures, and the lack of relationship between field work and campus courses." If these threats are to be challenged, then teacher educators must act. In addition to 11 recommendations for improving field programs, Dr. McIntyre has appended descriptions of exemplary field experience programs to provide specific guidance.

The Clearinghouse acknowledges with appreciation the superior work of Dr. McIntyre, an associate professor and coordinator of the student teaching center at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, in producing this ERIC information analysis product. Thanks also go to the three content reviewers, who shall remain anonymous, for their contributions to the draft manuscript.

The Clearinghouse is pleased also to copublish this monograph with the Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education. Created in November 1982, the Foundation offers this monograph as its premier publication recognizing excellence in professional scholarship.

SHARON GIVENS
Editor, ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education

ABOUT ERIC

ERIC, the Educational Resources Information Center, is a nationwide dissemination system of the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education. Through a network of 16 clearinghouses, ERIC collects, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes all kinds of educational literature, much of which is unavailable from other sources. Document literature includes project reports, conference speeches, curricular guides, instructional materials, and many other nonjournal articles. ERIC also indexes more than 700 educational journals. For information about ERIC, readers should consult the monthly ERIC periodicals, Resources in Education (RIE) or Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). These may be found at many college and university libraries along with the ERIC microfiche collection of documents.

Readers are invited and encouraged to comment on this monograph and to submit related documents to the Clearinghouse for possible inclusion in the ERIC system. For information, write the Senior Information Analyst, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036, or call (202) 293-2450.

THE FOUNDATION FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education (FETE) is dedicated to the advancement of teacher education.

In creating the Foundation, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education recognizes the education profession's commitment to preparing effective teachers and its conviction that excellent teaching makes a difference in the nation's schools. As a national forum established in November 1982 exclusively for and by teacher educators, FETE is charged with developing, implementing, and disseminating knowledge about teacher education. The Foundation will execute its charge as follows.

- o FETE will finance interns and scholars-in-residence whose research and development projects will add valid, reliable information to the knowledge base for teacher education.

- o FETE will fund training and technical assistance programs for schools, colleges, and departments of education.

- o FETE will publish scholarly works that foster communication among teacher educators and their various publics.

The Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education is a publicly supported, charitable, educational organization. For information about Foundation activities or to make a tax-deductible contribution, write to the Foundation at One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036, or call (202) 293-2450.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have contributed to the development of this monograph. I am most indebted to the efforts, advice, cajoling, and support of Sharon Givens, editor, and Devon Griffith, publications assistant. Laura Pind played a major role by typing the many drafts, catching my many mistakes, and listening to my many complaints.

Drs. David Byrd and William Norris reviewed original drafts and helped mold the ideas. Chastain Knapp of the Association of Teacher Educators helped compile the exemplary programs section.

Finally, a special thanks to Dr. Jim Collins, of Syracuse University, who first piqued my interest in field experiences, and to the many colleagues and students encountered over the years who shaped my philosophy and beliefs about education.

The Field Experience: An Introduction

Field experience is probably the most praised, most criticized, most entrenched, most debated but certainly least understood part of preservice teacher education. In general, field experience is designed as

> a continuous exploration and examination of educational possibilities in particular settings under varying conditions. It is not a static exercise in the demonstration of established productive curricular plans and imaginative teaching strategies through studied experimentation, coordinated analytical assessment and the consideration of alternative approaches. Curriculum development and instructional experimentation must be the matrix in which teacher education takes place if each new generation of teachers is to be innovative in its time. The scholarly study and practice of teaching by definition has to be an open-ended process of continuing discovery for everyone involved in the education of a teacher. (Association of Teacher Educators 1973, pp. 1-2)

For the past decade, two conflicting views have dominated debate on the value of field experiences. On one hand, some teachers regard field experiences as the most valuable part of their training, dismissing methods courses as irrelevant theory (Nosow 1975; Appleberry 1976; Haring and Nelson 1980). On the other hand, critics view field experience as merely a vehicle for socializing the undergraduate into a traditional teaching role in an existing institution (Friedenberg 1973; Lortie 1975). Zeichner (1979) supported the notion that field experiences are neither all good nor all bad; they entail complicated positive and negative consequences for both students and institutions.

This document investigates the complicated nature of the field experience. Several questions serve as points for study: What are the positive and negative results of field experiences? How do these experiences influence a teacher trainee? Do field experiences contribute positively to the training of competent teachers? Can modifications be made within the field experience component to produce general improvement in preservice teacher education programs?

Briefly, the areas of field experience to be discussed include the influences of field experiences on the attitudes and behavior of preservice students, the role of clinical faculty, the structure of field programs and models, evaluation of student performance during field experience, and assessment of the success of field experiences. This monograph seeks to provide comprehensive analysis of field experiences in teacher education to enhance understanding of field experience within the educational community and provide a basis for the recommendations offered in the last section.

The Influence of Field Experience

James B. Conant (1963) described field experience as the most important element in professional education. Apparently, teacher educators agreed because field experience in some form is included now in most, if not all, teacher-preparation programs. In the 1960s and early '70s, field experience was synonymous with student or practice teaching. Today, however, student teaching is but one segment of the field experience component. Currently, preservice teachers are sent into elementary and secondary classrooms earlier in their preparation and for extended periods. In several states, notably Illinois and Ohio, certification requirements have been revised to increase the number of hours preservice teachers spend in K-12 classrooms prior to student teaching.

Despite this apparent acceptance, the field experience component has its disparagers. Henry (1976) cautioned that the value of field experience should be questioned so that the component will be analyzed and modified as necessary. Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) claimed that field experience is the largest unvalidated segment of professional teacher education. If they were correct, then the role of field experience in a preservice program and the contribution of field experiences toward connecting theory and practice must be examined as Henry recommended.

The first matter requiring analysis is the influence of field experiences on the attitudes, behavior, and performance of preservice teachers as they mature from student to teacher. An important dimension of this influence is the relationship among the three people who comprise the field experience triad--the student, the university supervisor, and the cooperating teacher.

Stages of Student Teaching

A student in a preservice teacher preparation program moves through stages in the same sense that a person matures from infancy to old age. The two studies cited here examined student teaching only, but one may hypothesize that the phases described apply to other field experiences.

Caruso (1977) concluded that student teachers pass through six phases during student teaching. Phase one (Anxiety/Euphoria) is an uneasy period when students prepare to leave the college campus for the school classroom. In phase two (Confusion/Clarity), students begin to form cohesive notions about teaching, although their perceptions of the classroom and of themselves as teachers remain narrow. Phase three (Competence/Inadequacy) involves a fragile equilibrium between students' feelings of competence and inadequacy. The cooperating teacher and the university supervisor play vital roles during this phase in building students' confidence. In phase four (Criticism/Awareness), students devote greater thought to children and

professional issues. Concerns about survival in teaching fade in phase five (More Confidence/Greater Inadequacy); although troubled by an inability to meet high personal standards, students seek greater responsibility and independence. In the final phase (Loss/Relief), students express both regret upon leaving their pupils and relief at having made it.

Sacks and Harrington (1982) also identified six stages of development from student to teacher, several of which recall Caruso's stages. Stage one (Anticipation) occurs before the student teacher begins work in the classroom and is characterized by eagerness, excitement, and nervous anxiety. The student often seeks support and reassurance from the university supervisor. During stage two (Entry), the student is excited to begin the experience but worried that the challenge is too great. Often, the student relies on teacher-like behaviors learned from others and feels satisfied simply to get through each lesson. Stage three (Orientation) finds the student feeling inadequate and incompetent, painfully aware of the complexity of teaching. As a result of their preoccupation with personal struggles, stage-three student teachers tend to view pupils as a large, monolithic group. More time is spent in stage four (Trial and Error) than in any other as the student teacher struggles to find the "right" way to teach, to manage pupils, to assert power in the classroom, and to grow into an independent, autonomous teacher. In stage five (Integration/Consolidation), students experience effectiveness more consistently and begin to concentrate on the needs of pupils rather than on personal needs. Few students attain stage six (Mastery), though many glimpse it. This stage indicates an understanding of self as person and teacher, an awareness of strengths and weaknesses, and a recognition that there are many ways to reach the goal of effective teaching.

The preservice teacher experiences many emotional peaks and valleys during field experiences. Conflict and stress accompany most of the phases, and people encountered during this period--cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and pupils--often trigger upheaval. The student teacher attempts to please these people while undergoing evaluation by two of them, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Further, the strain of learning to teach in an institution with established guidelines and both social and professional norms can erode students' confidence, attitude, behavior, and performance. Thus, it is important to understand how the people and the experience itself affect the preservice teacher.

The Role of Interpersonal Relationships

Most research on interpersonal relationships developed during field experience has concentrated on student teaching. Traditionally, a triad forms involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. As Yee (1967) reported, the triadic relationship can lead to tension, especially if the cooperating teacher and university supervisor make conflicting demands on, or hold conflicting expectations of, the student teacher. A commonly accepted reason for such conflicts, as stated by Vickery and Brown (1967), is that the educational philosophy of the typical university supervisor is liberal, that of the typical cooperating teacher conservative. These conflicting philosophies, then, may result in tensions within the triad. Peterson (1977) discovered that the student anticipates philosophical confrontations between university and school faculty prior to student teaching.

Cooperating teacher. Much of the research on the student-teaching triad examines the cooperating teacher's influence on the student teacher. This is not surprising: Many teachers view their cooperating teachers as having had the most significant influence on their student-teaching experience (Karmos and Jacko 1977; Manning 1977). Apparently, this influence shapes students' attitudes and behavior, but has questionable effect on performance.

Studies by Dunham (1958), Price (1961), and Johnson (1969) indicated that, as the professional semester progresses, the attitudes of student teachers incline toward those of their cooperating teachers. More specifically, Mahan and Lacefield (1976) found that cooperating teachers hold powerful influence over student teachers' attitudes about schooling. Where disparities existed between student teachers and their cooperating teachers, the former tended to adjust their values toward those of the latter.

Other studies suggest that such merging of attitudes depends on personality characteristics of the student and cooperating teacher. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI), designed to assess a teacher's attitude toward pupils, was used in much of the research on attitudes. Coss (1959) and Scott and Brinkley (1960) provided evidence that student teachers who worked with cooperating teachers possessing attitudes initially lower than their own showed either retardation in attitudinal growth or no growth at all. Perrodin (1961) reported that student teachers recording the highest gains on the MTAI were supervised by cooperating teachers who had completed a special program in supervision.

In a more recent study, James, Etheridge, and Bryant (1982) warned that although student teachers' beliefs about discipline tend to merge toward those of their cooperating teachers, the data are inconclusive as to the influence of the cooperating teachers on this shift. It may be, as Zeichner (1979) suggested, that the shifting of student teachers' attitudes toward those of the cooperating teacher is but a general phenomenon: Some student teachers do not adopt the beliefs of their cooperating teachers.

Another area of research examines the cooperating teacher's influence on the student teacher's actual teaching performance. Price's (1961) data on the performance of cooperating teachers and student teachers indicated that student teachers adopt many of the practices of the cooperating teacher. Studies by Joyce and Seperson (1973) and Zevin (1974) concluded that student teachers make significant movement toward the classroom style displayed by their cooperating teachers. However, other evidence contradicts these views.

The notion that cooperating teachers are the major influence on students' acquisition of teaching skills is suspect. First, Joyce and Seperson's (1973) study revealed that a cooperating teacher's influence is strong for only the first few weeks of student teaching. Second, McIntyre, Buell, and Casey (1979) reported that student teachers do not model the verbal behavior of their cooperating teachers. Third, Copeland's (1977) study suggested that the major influence on a student teacher's acquisition of skills is not the cooperating teacher, but the ecology of the school. The pupils, the physical environment, the curriculum, the community, and many other variables support and promote a student teacher's performance. Thus, it may be that cooperating teachers affect only certain practices or variables, not all.

University supervisor. Of the three members of the student-teaching triad, the university supervisor has been criticized most often for not fulfilling the role of instructional leader (Diamonti 1977). Several studies reported that university supervisors have little identifiable effect on student teachers' attitudes and behavior (Sandgren and Schmidt 1956; Schueler,

Gold, and Mitzel 1962). Morris's (1974) study clearly illustrated this point: Ninety-six student teachers were divided into a control group placed with both a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor, and an experimental group placed only with a cooperating teacher. Morris found no statistically significant difference between the classroom performance of student teachers who received supervision from the university supervisor and the classroom performance of those who did not, as recorded on final evaluations of their student-teaching performance. Also, no significant difference was found between the adjustment of student teachers who received supervision from the university supervisor and the adjustment of those who did not.

On the other hand, some data suggest that the university supervisor does influence the student teacher. A questionnaire administered to experienced teachers by Bennie (1964) disclosed that university supervisors improve student-teacher performance. Friebus (1977) found that university supervisors play an important role as "coaches," providing suggestions and ideas about specific teaching problems. Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott (1980) reported that cooperating teachers in general do not review students' work critically and that without university supervisors, students would receive no criticism. This study also reported that the chief activities of the university supervisor were defining and communicating the program's expectations of the student and cooperating teacher, phasing the student into the classroom's activity, and providing evaluation and constructive criticism. Fink (1976) also had noted cooperating teachers' tendency to write positive evaluations of student teachers, even when the cooperating teacher had spent little time observing the student. Corrigan and Griswold (1963) found that student teachers working with certain supervisors consistently became more positive in their attitudes toward teaching, schools, and children. Students with these positive attitude changes perceived their university supervisors as influencing these changes. Although findings of research on university supervisors are not as clear as those on cooperating teachers, one may reasonably infer that the supervisor has some influence on the student teacher, but that methods employed to define that influence have been inappropriate. In this regard, Zeichner (1978) urged that research on field experience employ the study methods of sociology and anthropology.

To summarize, data concerning the interpersonal relationships within field experiences, especially student teaching, are inconclusive. Some data indicate that the cooperating teacher exerts significantly more influence on the student teacher's attitudes and behavior than does the university supervisor; other data indicate that the university supervisor has significantly more effect on the student teacher's performance. It may be that while the cooperating teacher influences the student's attitude and teaching style, the university supervisor refines that style. However, data also suggest that teachers' and supervisors' degree of influence on students may depend more on the the personalities of those in the triad than on their designated roles. The characteristics of the setting in which student teaching takes place may also influence the student teacher's acquisition of skills. More sophisticated research is needed to improve understanding of the interpersonal dynamics of field experiences. For example, McIntyre and Norris (1980) suggested that future studies might adopt a trait-treatment interaction design, examining characteristics of university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and student teachers to determine which traits most influence student teachers. Other variables that invite examination include the principal, community, pupils, and parents.

Preservice student. A major flaw of research in teacher education is the lack of data concerning preservice students' influence on the field experience. To date, researchers have focused mainly on the many variables, such as teachers, professors, the public school, or the university, that affect the student. Thus, it is difficult to assess the influence, if any, of the preservice student or the role he or she assumes in the classroom.

However, in a study of the classroom environment, McIntyre, Copenhaver, Jacko, and O'Bryan (1982) found that pupils perceived student teachers to establish a less positive classroom environment than that established by cooperating teachers. In the student teacher's classroom, the pupils perceived themselves as less likely to succeed, to persist in overcoming obstacles, to respect authority, to think objectively, and to encounter practical applications of a subject or skill than in the cooperating teacher's classroom. However, although the perceived classroom environment of the student teacher is less positive than that of the regular teacher, the environment scores for both kinds of teacher were positive.

Tabachnick, Popkewitz, and Zeichner (1979-80) examined student teachers' activity in the classroom. They discovered that student teachers were involved in a narrow range of classroom activities, over which they had little control. Their teaching was routine and mechanical, and became equated with moving children through prescribed lessons in a given period of time. Further, student teachers' interactions with children were brief and impersonal, usually related to the task at hand. Their interactions with cooperating teachers revealed conscious avoidance of conflict and substantive discussion. Students' low status, punctuated by the institutional press to move children through prescribed lessons on time and in an orderly manner, prevented serious reflection upon performance.

Clearly, more research is necessary for a better understanding of the influence and role of preservice students during field experience. The remainder of this section examines the influences of the field experience on the student.

Attitude Changes

In addition to examining the complexities of the triad, it is important to investigate the changes that occur in preservice teachers' attitudes during field experience. This research reveals a more consistent pattern.

In general, students' attitudes seem to become more custodial and negative during field experience. Villeme and Hall (1975) reported a general decrease in attitude scores, as measured by MTAI, at the end of student teaching. More specifically, Dutton (1962), Alper and Retish (1972), and Dispoto (1980) found that preservice students' attitudes toward children declined significantly as they progressed through field experiences and that their attitudes merged toward those of the cooperating teacher. In addition, Henry and Sa'ad (1977) discovered that student teachers seemed to associate poor teaching with teachers whose classrooms were child-centered as opposed to subject-centered. However, one could interpret declining attitudes of preservice students toward children as a growing realism born of experience.

Other attitudes also appear to change during field experiences. For example, Alper and Retish (1972) and Dispoto (1980) found that preservice teachers' attitudes toward teaching and school became less favorable after student teaching. Jacobs (1968) reported that student teachers adopt more rigid, custodial attitudes toward teaching. Wilbur and Gooding (1977)

indicated that students become more concealing, and less willing to share with their peers.

Field experience also seems to influence students' attitudes toward classroom management and organization. Studies by Hoy (1967, 1968, 1969), Fink (1976), Wilbur and Gooding (1977), and Williamson and Campbell (1978) found that as preservice students progress through student teaching, ideas about classroom discipline become more custodial and more focused on pupil control. Iannacone (1963) and Iannacone and Button (1964) described preservice students as increasingly committed to finishing lessons on time rather than to demonstrating concern for pupils.

More recent data dispute these studies of student teachers' attitudes toward management and organization. Copenhaver, McIntyre, and Norris (1981) and Sacks and Harrington (1982) reported that at the conclusion of the field experience, students express more concern for the emotional needs of their pupils than for classroom control. Zeichner (1978) also disputed the likelihood of movement toward a custodial attitude in all field experience settings. He stated that situational variables--classroom and school environment, cooperating teachers' attitudes, curriculum, etc.--have a great impact on the ideology adopted by the student. Further, it is possible, as Burden (1982) suggested, that natural developmental phases exist for anyone progressing from the role of student to that of teacher and the responsibility that teaching entails.

Again, it is important to note the lack of research on preservice teachers' changes in behavior during field experience. The fact that attitudes change does not mean that teaching behavior undergoes corresponding changes. Research on teaching behavior must involve classroom observation, not self-report instruments. Historically, researchers have ignored the relationship between the various aspects of field experience and the subsequent behavior of teachers. Future studies must focus on this relationship if meaningful reform of field experiences is to occur.

Socialization Process

The data presented above constitute much of the evidence offered by those who criticize field experience as merely a means of socializing the preservice student into the established beliefs and practices of elementary and secondary schools, thus inhibiting the development of innovative, reflective, and competent teachers (Friedenberg 1973; Lortie 1975; Salzillo and Van Fleet 1977; Schoenrock 1980). Field experiences, these critics argue, serve covertly to socialize preservice students into accepted institutional roles and minimize opportunities for students to examine how schools operate or to understand the social role of schools and schooling. If this is true, and research as noted lends credence to the notion, then teacher education must question the value of the current practice of field experience.

In any examination, the following points should be considered. First, it is not the intent of teacher training programs to produce mere clones of cooperating teachers or to foster less-than-favorable attitudes toward teaching, children, and school. Second, with field experiences being introduced earlier in the preservice program, students adopt the schools' philosophies and attitudes earlier in their training, rejecting notions inculcated by university teacher education programs. Theories and methods taught in university courses may lose credibility as students gain field experience. For example, if a student's reading methods course ignores the

teaching of phonics but the student discovers that phonics is the established method in the school, the credibility of that methods course, and campus training in general, tarnishes.

Recent research posits serious doubts about the social-puppet view of teacher socialization. This view, typically supported by previously cited data, portrays the preservice teacher as a passive entity who unquestioningly absorbs school attitudes and behaviors. Zeichner (1980) and Egan (1982) both proposed another view: Despite social constraints, students exert some control over the direction of the socialization process. In Zeichner and Egan's studies, some students, although a minority, resisted the dominant beliefs and practices encountered in field experience settings and did not become more conservative and rigid. Roberts and Blankenship (1970) described the socialization process as complex, the result of the interaction of many factors. For example, the merging of student and cooperating-teacher attitudes may depend both on the student teacher's perception of the pupil-control ideology of the cooperating teacher and on the degree of difference between the pupil-control ideologies of the student and the teacher. Lacey (1977) suggested that as students proceed through student teaching, they continually compare their past experiences to the social structure of the classroom and school. Thus, Lacey concluded, student teachers play an active role in determining the direction of socialization efforts. Zeichner (1980) suggested that the existence of these "resistors" indicates that socialization may involve contradiction as well as imitation. Further, Lortie (1975) stated that teacher socialization is largely completed before formal training. As a result, a diversity of perspectives does emerge from field experiences. Egan (1982) pointed out that students' perspectives on teaching appear to be clarified by experiences and their interpretation of these experiences. Thus, the once universally held beliefs that field experiences mold preservice students according to existing institutional norms and hamper teacher education programs by negating their influence on future teachers are being challenged as too simplistic.

One such challenge emerged from the work of Zeichner and Tabachnick (1981), who stated that one can no longer assume that universities liberalize students or that schools alone create undesirable teaching perspectives. Zeichner and Tabachnik urged researchers in teacher education to turn their attention to closer and more subtle analysis of the impact of university courses, symbols, procedures, and rituals upon the professional perspectives of teacher trainees. Failure to scrutinize university practices as they evolve legitimates those practices. If universities hope to prepare progressive teachers, Zeichner and Tabachnick stressed, they must first reflect more on their own endeavors.

Future research also must focus on the student's assimilation of varied contextual experiences. Zeichner (1980) argued that if research on teacher socialization is to illuminate this process, it must capture the complicated nuances involved in the process of becoming a teacher. Longitudinal studies that follow the neophyte from the start of formal training through early teaching would be especially useful. Such studies would aid in discovering why certain students cannot or will not resist socialization. In addition, we must learn whether the influences of field experiences in general and cooperating teachers specifically are as pervasive and as negative as suggested by some studies.

Schoenrock (1980) and Zeichner (1981) suggested the adoption of an "inquiry-oriented" or reflective approach to field experience as a means of resisting the undesirable effects of socialization. The reflective approach,

discussed in more detail later, attempts to train students not only to teach, but also to analyze their teaching in relation to the educational and social contexts in which teaching takes place. Zeichner described this as an "attempt to prepare teachers who not only have the skills to do, but also the skills to analyze what they are doing and the habit of mind to do so" (p. 12). Interestingly, Friedenberg (1973) had stated that few would question the value of field experience if students were evaluated on their ability to reflect upon educational processes.

In summary, preservice students' attitudes are influenced in many complex ways. Research suggests that a student progressing through field experience probably develops less favorable attitudes toward teaching, children, and school, and becomes more custodial in teaching practice. Does this mean that teacher education should abandon field experiences? Is not some movement from idealism to realism natural during field experience? Why do some students conform to public school norms while others do not? Perhaps the recent trend toward longitudinal studies, which examine the interaction between individual and institution before and during field experience, will improve our understanding of the influence of field experiences on the student (Tabachnick, Zeichner, Densmore, Adler, and Egan 1982). To be sure, the notion that preservice students passively absorb institutional doctrine lies open to question.

If the interaction between students and those people encountered during field experience determines whether and how students become socialized, then it is important to understand the roles prescribed for the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. The following section examines the role of clinical faculty and their effect on teacher education and field experience.

The Role of Clinical Faculty

As a result of Conant's (1963) urging that the role of the student teacher's supervisor be modeled after that of the clinical professor in medical schools, the clinical professorship began to surface in the dialogue of teacher education. Bennie (1978) called the creation of the university supervisor as a college professional a milestone in the development of field experiences. However, the role, function, and status of clinical faculty have been in constant flux since the inception of field experiences. Kazlov's (1976) national survey of clinical professorships revealed little agreement on the role of clinical faculty. In fact, many institutions use the term for any college member assigned to supervise field experiences (Warner et al. 1976). This section examines the role, function, and status of teacher educators assigned to supervise student teachers.

Models of the Classroom Teacher Educator

Research by Kazlov (1976) and Warner et al. (1976) pointed out that universities use a variety of models to engage teacher educators in field experiences. MacNaughton, Johns, and Rogus (1978) described the following five models and the accompanying roles of the university supervisor and cooperating teacher.

Traditional. In this model, the cooperating teacher serves only occasionally in the teacher training process. The university supervisor consults with the cooperating teacher and observes and evaluates the student teacher. The supervisor makes little attempt to establish a relationship with the elementary or secondary school.

Modified traditional. This model resembles the traditional model except that the cooperating teacher frequently supervises either a student teacher or a pre-student teacher. The model often involves the grouping of student teachers in a school district under the guidance of one university supervisor. The supervisor is more of a coordinator, with greater opportunity to observe students. This usually increases communication between campus and field. As a result, the university supervisor becomes involved in inservice and staff development within the district.

Clinical professor. In this model, the university supervisor or clinical professor's sole responsibility is to the field experience program. Also, the cooperating teacher often holds a joint appointment at both school and university and occasionally teaches at the university.

Teacher adjunct. The cooperating teacher holds full authority for assessing student teachers; the role of the university supervisor is diminished greatly.

Master teacher/apprentice. The student teacher is assigned to the public school for training and has no university supervisor.

Perceptions of the Clinical Faculty Role

The role of clinical faculty was conceived, for the most part, in response to harsh criticism of the traditional approach to university supervision of field experiences. Traditionally, faculty assigned to supervise field experiences also teach on campus. They have knowledge of the variety of field experiences, but little time for visits with preservice students and little training in supervision (Brosio 1975). Kline and Dale (1975) described the traditional method of university supervision as inefficient, often involving more time traveling than observing, conferring, and planning. Both the system's inefficiency and the supervisor's lack of experience and commitment may contribute to the lack of influence the university supervisor has on the preservice student. Consequently, some critics have labeled the position of university supervisor of field experiences a needless drain upon dwindling resources and have urged its abolishment (Bowman 1979).

In the beginning, the clinical professorship was envisioned as a link between campus instruction and teaching practice in the schools, and was to be based primarily in the schools (Warner et al. 1977). The goal was to maximize the personal and professional growth of preservice students while contributing to the programs of the cooperating school systems (Bredemeier, Kindsvatter, and Wilen 1975). Clinical faculty would apply their scholarly skills at the point of implementation--the schools--and would accept responsibility for addressing the needs of the institution and the community.

The role and function of clinical faculty are more specific than in traditional supervision, and the responsibilities broader. For example, clinical faculty often find themselves both providing preservice and inservice assistance and using the schools as laboratories for research into educational practice (Kline and Dale 1975). Since assistance and research involve working closely with administrators, teachers, school boards, and parents, Bredemeier, Kindsvatter, and Wilen (1975) suggested that clinical faculty must understand human relations, work successfully within political structures, and maintain perspective and patience while promoting growth in both the preservice student and the inservice teacher.

Functions central to the clinical professor include working with preservice students who possess diverse abilities and interests, working in public schools, rigorously applying standard procedures for instructional decision making, and providing knowledge-based, supportive evaluation of students' performance (Warner et al. 1977). The last two functions are crucial to the effectiveness of the clinical professor and imply the ability to monitor students' improvement. Diamonti (1977) noted that true understanding of teaching comes indirectly from discussions with supervisors, but directly from self-reflection upon one's performance. He added that if one assumes a clinical orientation and treats supervision as a process whereby the supervisor helps the student learn about teaching, the clinician must have the knowledge and skill to articulate the elements of good teaching and convey

them to the preservice student. Raising one's knowledge to a conscious level and then communicating it to a student can be difficult, but both may be more realistic expectations under the clinical faculty model than under traditional university supervision. In the former the clinician has not only the knowledge but also the training in supervision to communicate that knowledge to the student.

Implicit in the clinical faculty concept is the notion of the generalist supervisor. Normally, the clinician supervises all students assigned to a specific school or cluster of schools, as in a teaching center. This usually entails the supervision of preservice students working in elementary schools or in content areas in secondary schools. Thus, the clinical professor serves as the teaching-skills specialist and the cooperating teacher as the content specialist; both work closely with the preservice student to improve performance. In contrast, the traditional model employs subject specialists, who often have little or no training in supervision, to supervise students in their specialties.

Regarding the effectiveness of the clinical and traditional models of supervision, Nance (1977) gave much of the credit for the production of better, more highly trained teachers to the increased knowledge, competence, and dedication of generalist clinical faculty. In another study, Herbster (1975) found significant differences between generalist and specialist supervisors for seven variables: Generalists had more teaching experience at elementary and secondary levels, spent more time with preservice students, were given more students, held more conferences with school administrators, advised the university's director of field experiences of problems, and enhanced relations between university and school. The specialist supervisor received credit only for teaching more courses on campus.

In later studies, Freeland (1978) found that preservice students preferred clinical/generalist supervision, and Quisenberry, Quisenberry, and Willis (1978) reported that both cooperating teachers and preservice students support the generalist model. The latter study showed that the generalist model recognizes and makes better use of the expertise of cooperating teachers. Also, Quisenberry et al. discovered that specialist supervisors were normally viewed as intruders who visited student teachers infrequently and appeared unfamiliar or unconcerned with a school's unique needs.

Despite scanty research in this area, it appears that the clinical faculty model, when applied appropriately, accomplishes its goals and has a higher rate of acceptance among preservice students and cooperating teachers. However, to understand this model fully, the role and effectiveness of the cooperating teacher as a supervisor must be examined also.

Perceptions of the Cooperating Teacher

Haberman (1971), Spillane and Levenson (1976), and Bowman (1979) questioned the effectiveness of the university supervisor and recommended eliminating the position. These educators would place all of the supervisor's responsibility with cooperating teachers. Thus, cooperating teachers would conduct all observations, conferences, evaluations, and the myriad duties formerly the domain of the university supervisor.

From the few attempts to examine the supervisory skill of the cooperating teacher, it appears that this role is not fulfilled as effectively as one might hope. First, cooperating teachers often are selected because they are willing to work with preservice students, or because an administrator appoints

them, or because it is their turn; the criteria for selection, training, and experience may be waived in favor of expediency. Further, in some states, the placement of preservice students has become an issue in collective bargaining--to protect the rights of cooperating teachers, it seems, as much as to ensure expert guidance for students (Howey 1977).

Second, cooperating teachers tend to praise more than criticize preservice students. Lynch and Kuehl (1979) challenged cooperating teachers to provide more criticism and more assistance with specific teaching strategies. A study by Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott (1980) supported this recommendation. They found that cooperating teachers were not interested in observing student teachers; they wanted to involve students fully within one week of placement. Also, cooperating teachers tended to avoid critical evaluations and negative remarks. This finding supports Fink's (1976) evidence that cooperating teachers tend to write positive evaluations of preservice students without observing them. On the basis of such studies, McIntyre and Norris (1980) recommended that cooperating teachers not be trained as replacements for university supervisors.

Copeland and Boyan (1975) advocated inservice training in sophisticated techniques of analyzing teaching in the hope of improving the supervisory skills of cooperating teachers. However, Zeichner (1979) doubted whether learning new techniques, without corresponding changes in roles and power structures, would change more than the surface of supervisory relationships. Although cooperating teachers may gain analytical and communicative skills from such training, they still must confront preservice students who appear to insulate themselves from criticism (Zeichner 1979).

From the evidence in this section, it seems inadvisable to assign cooperating teachers sole responsibility for supervison. Rather, these data support the clinical faculty model in which a full-time university faculty member, trained in the analysis of teaching and in modifying teacher behavior, is assigned to the field site and works closely with cooperating teachers.

Status of Clinical Faculty

Given the tremendous responsibilities of elementary and secondary school teachers, one would expect that their trainers would command esteem. On the contrary, both teacher education and its clinical faculty hold little prestige within or without the education community (Howey 1977). Of course, it is difficult to achieve status when universities themselves give low priority to preservice teacher education, which in many universities is the easiest, cheapest professional school to establish (Spillane and Levenson 1976).

Kachur and Lang (1975) questioned the commitment of higher education to clinical experiences as teacher unions and schools assume more control over field experiences. They stated that unless universities take more initiative and responsibility for field experiences, higher education will face three alternatives: (1) to explore and implement alternative models, such as laboratory schools and simulations; (2) to permit local K-12 schools to determine field experience policy; or (3) to abandon all responsibility for clinical experiences.

The low status of preservice teacher education programs and field experience relates directly to the low status of the clinical professor. Since the university hierarchy seldom acknowledges in any positive way the existence of clinical education faculty, traditional university reward systems do not recognize their efforts (Black 1976; Bowman 1979). Most universities

use the traditional model of supervision in which supervisors, who are usually content specialists, are selected primarily on the basis of availability, not supervisory skill (Black 1976). The traditional model also often engages the supervisor in teaching on campus. Since on-campus teaching has higher institutional value than off-campus supervision, faculty may tend to regard field experiences as a low priority (Wiles and Branch 1979). At many large, state universities the status of clinical supervisors is especially low; supervision may be delegated to graduate students and viewed primarily as a means of supporting the graduate program.

A recent study (Katz et al. 1982) indicated complex reasons for the low status of preservice teacher education and clinical experiences. For example, the study, which focused on six dimensions of reputation, showed that preservice students assigned higher values to the reputation of teacher educators than did public school teachers or liberal arts and science professors. Teacher educators were rated lowest on special and general knowledge but highest on their effectiveness as teachers.

The reasons for assigning low status are contradictory. Public school teachers dismiss teacher educators as high-minded, impractical, idealistic, too theoretical, and too scientific, but campus colleagues view teacher educators as too practical, atheoretical, and "arts-and-craftsy." The researchers suggested that if teacher educators, including clinical faculty, are to be accepted by both groups, they must learn to operate successfully in both school and university.

Summary

Although the clinical faculty model of supervision appears most appropriate for field experiences, few universities execute it effectively. In many universities, faculty are assigned the role of clinician without prior training in or commitment to field experiences. Compounding this predicament is the low priority that universities give to clinical experiences. Consequently, the best and brightest teacher educators may find field experience programs unworthy of their commitment.

In addition, the literature suggests that cooperating teachers may be ineffective as teacher trainers. Although training in supervision and knowledge of teaching may alter this situation, the ineffectiveness of cooperating teachers compels universities to place skilled and knowledgeable clinicians in the field. However, incentives must be provided to attract skilled people to field experiences. Then, clinicians must be given time to perform their roles. Failure to do so merely supports the premise that clinical field experiences are of little value.

Program Structures

To understand the field experience, one must assay the elementary and secondary school settings and programs where preservice students are placed, and examine how that environment influences the triad's interaction. One also must explore the structure of field experience programs.

Structural Models for Field Experiences

The environments in which students are placed for field experiences may affect crucially their development as teachers. As Manning (1977) discovered, student teachers placed in settings incongruent with their backgrounds often develop negative attitudes about their field experiences and the people involved. Should field experience programs prepare students in settings congruent with their background, or should students prepare for any eventuality, knowing that they will be obliged to embrace the philosophies of the schools that hire them (Sandberg 1978)? To date, this question has not received adequate answer. This section focuses on the problem by examining structural models for the delivery of field experiences and programs delivered within these models.

University model. Problems encountered by student teachers during field experiences often result from personality conflicts within the school settings (Elliott and Draba 1978). Already, this paper has considered in depth the role of the cooperating teacher in field experiences. Further, evidence by Casey and McNeil (1972) revealed differences in the attitudes of students and cooperating teachers that could lead to early communication problems and perhaps adversely affect the learning situation in the classroom.

For many field experiences, especially student teaching, the student works with one cooperating teacher for the duration of the program. Price (1972) compared this arrangement to indentured servitude. The cooperating teacher decides what and how much the student will do; the student works within the framework established by the cooperating teacher and performs without pay duties normally performed by the teacher. Rarely is the student extended the opportunity to observe other classrooms.

Having only one cooperating teacher may constrict a student's outlook on teaching. Three alternate strategies have been suggested to address this problem. Price (1972), Shuman (1972), and Mahan (1976-77) recommended assigning preservice students to groups of cooperating teachers representing different grade levels and philosophies regarding education and schooling. Mahan (1976-77) and McIntyre and Norris (1980a) advocated matching students, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors on the basis of interests, personalities, and so on, thus creating an optimal atmosphere for professional

growth. In a similar system supported by Elliott and Draba's work (1978), students consult with university clinical faculty to select teachers and situations most attractive to them.

However, more research is needed to ascertain the worth of these strategies. For example, does the matching strategy address the need to expose students to a variety of philosophies, to broaden their orientations, or to prepare them to teach in a variety of situations? This strategy still seems to have the student working within the framework and daily routine of a cooperating teacher. The only difference is the likelihood that this framework would be congruent with the student teacher's initial orientation.

In addition, Leslie (1972) found that careful selection of the cooperating teacher neither aided nor impeded the performance of the novice teacher. However, Becker and Ade's (1982) study threw more light on this finding. These researchers found that students did not perceive their cooperating teachers as good teaching models if they were not specifically designated as such. Thus, they contended that the current practice of placing student teachers with good teaching models has little effect since the mere presence of a good model is not related to the students' performance ratings. These studies support the need for additional research to determine the effect of people, schools, and cultures on preservice students during the field experience. Without this knowledge, field placements will continue on the basis of intuition rather than informed judgment.

School-based model. Since the early '70s, some universities have decentralized their preservice teacher education programs by adopting a field-centered concept in which much of the program is conducted in selected elementary and secondary schools (Barnett 1975). Merwin and Templeton (1973) claimed that preservice students and cooperating teachers considered university courses offered at school sites more valuable because of the opportunities to observe and work with pupils and to relate course work to real settings. However, are public schools equipped to deliver university methods courses (McIntyre 1979b)? Barnett (1975) cautioned that a university could lose control of its programs under such a model. For example, the public schools' resources rather than the university's would determine the scope of the program. Access to library and other supporting facilities would be severely limited.

Again, more research is needed on the effectiveness and desirability of school-based field programs. For example, does immediate access to actual classrooms improve a course's effectiveness? Are courses in the schools delivered differently from those on campus? Do public schools influence school-based programs more than campus-based programs?

Teaching center model. Teaching centers represent another important setting for field experience. A teaching center encompasses a school district or group of districts to which preservice students report for field experiences. A university clinician assigned to the center is responsible not only for the preservice program delivered in that district, but also for developing or facilitating an inservice program for teachers.

Gardner (1979) listed several advantages of using teaching centers: (1) the placing of relatively large numbers of interns in school dramatically alters the teacher/pupil ratio and makes possible classroom activities that otherwise would be difficult; (2) the enriched student/teacher mix frees teachers for planning, evaluating, or other tasks during the school day; and (3) the presence of clinical faculty from the university provides extra skill

and knowledge, as well as access to campus resources. McIntyre (1979a) suggested that field experience programs based in teacher centers facilitate the integration of theory and practice by meshing preservice and inservice programs. This model provides a mechanism for training preservice students and cooperating teachers in the same techniques. It also allows university faculty to interact with classroom teachers in the field while creating, testing, and implementing strategies in actual classrooms. In addition, McIntyre and Vickery (1979) found that teaching centers seem to reduce the anxiety students feel under observation by clinical professors because clinicians based in the schools become familiar to the students.

Another study (Burns et al. 1973) on the effectiveness of teaching centers for student teaching found that students in centers accomplished no more of their learning goals than did noncenter students. Center cooperating teachers apparently held no higher expectations of student teachers than did noncenter cooperating teachers. However, this study did not examine differences in the performance of center and noncenter student teachers.

In conclusion, despite the importance of the settings in which field experiences occur, little research exists that contributes to our understanding of environmental influences on students and teacher education programs. Yet, without a sound research base, we cannot expect to achieve the objectives of preservice programs. Future research must determine: Which models promote the most effective supervision? Which models promote positive relations between university and public school? Which models are most cost effective for both universities and public schools? Which models ultimately produce the most competent, self-reliant teachers?

Answers to these questions will help teacher educators agree as to whether placing a preservice student in familiar surroundings and with like personalities enhances professional growth. Additional data should be collected to determine the effectiveness of alternative types of field settings, such as the teaching center.

Early Field Experiences

Early field experience programs are common in most professions, including law, business, and health care. Gehrke (1981) listed six rationales for early field experiences found in the literature of these professions: (1) learning theory (for learning to have personal meaning, the learner must experience, in context, the realities underlying the ideas taught); (2) motivation (early field experiences encourage learning); (3) vocational choice (early field experiences allow early career exploration and decision); (4) economy (providing clinical experiences in the field rather than in campus laboratory schools or simulated environments may be cheaper); (5) socio-politics (the student can offer considerable help in the classroom); (6) institutional revitalization (placing students in the field increases exposure of professional educators to new ideas).

The arguments cited in education literature as benefits of early field experiences to the teaching profession resemble those cited by Gehrke (1981). First, early field experiences in teacher education allow students to discover if they like children and want to teach (Tom 1976; Elliott and Mays 1979). Second, early field experiences permit the university to determine if a student has the potential to succeed in teaching (Elliott and Mays 1979). Third, students can practice and develop teaching skills before assuming classroom responsibility in student teaching (Elliott and Mays 1979; Seiferth

and Samuel 1979). Fourth, early field experiences develop a base of perceptions of classroom life on which later theoretical knowledge builds (Tom 1976). Fifth, early field experiences improve communication between universities and public schools (Elliott and Mays 1979; Krutstchinsky and Moore 1981). Sixth, early field experiences accelerate development from student to teacher (Tom 1976). Finally, early field experiences reduce the number of functions student teaching must fulfill (Tom 1976).

Program models. Elliott and Mays (1979) described three models for early field experiences. The "course specific" model, the most common for early field experiences, attaches on-site field work to an existing teacher education course. Easy to plan and implement, this model lets students see theory learned at the university applied in the classroom almost simultaneously.

The second model, called the "block of courses" model, is most often implemented in elementary teacher preparation programs. Planned around a block of courses, this model allows for field experiences that are instructionally interrelated as in actual classroom teaching.

The third model is the "program related" model. Least commonly used, this model specifies the field experiences a preservice student should have but does not relate them to individual courses. Assigned a location and a university supervisor, the student spends the freshman and sophomore years observing and the junior and senior years participating. The major advantage of this model is that it makes the placement of students more efficient, especially for large universities in small communities, by allowing a central field experience office to handle all placements and schedules. Its major disadvantage is that it does not relate field study to course work, so that the student does not see the immediate application of theory to practice.

Problems in early field experiences. Despite the apparent entrenchment of early field experience within teacher education, problems persist. Elliott and Mays (1979) divided the problems in early field experience into two areas: philosophical problems and logistical problems. Philosophical problems revolve around two questions: What is the proper training for teachers? If a student can learn so much in the field, why not move the entire preservice program and responsibility for the program to the public schools? Logistical problems include placing students appropriately and establishing a process for doing so that does not overburden schools or universities. In addition, when large numbers of students await placement, early field experience programs may require extra budgeting for added personnel, travel, and administrative time.

Tom (1976) cited as a potential drawback in early field experiences the lack of good teacher models for novices to observe in the classroom. This could result in students learning poor teaching practices early in their careers. In addition, echoing Price (1972), Tom warned against early field experiences evolving into apprenticeships. In this scenario, the early field experience student would simply carry out, without guidance or reflection, duties normally performed by the cooperating teacher.

Kay and Ishler (1980) reported that the cooperating teacher, the professional most involved in the assessment of the student during early field experiences, seldom receives training for this role. This is particularly discouraging considering that some of the reasons for early field experience spring from the belief that students' growth relates to the quality of guidance they receive from cooperating teachers and university supervisors.

Research on early field experiences. The almost blind acceptance of the value of field experiences justifies examination of the research in this area. The pervasiveness of early field experiences was supported by Ishler and Kay's (1981) study that found 99 percent of the reporting institutions to have early field experience programs and that 80 percent of these institutions have had these programs for at least five years. Also, the study revealed that 50 percent of the institutions engage students in field work as early as the freshman year and that most early field experiences accompany education courses. Again, these data suggest that early field experiences are an integral part of teacher education.

Sunal (1980) explored the relationship between early field experience involvement during an elementary methods course and preservice students' knowledge and performance of inquiry skills. The study indicated that increased involvement in early field experiences improves a preservice teacher's performance of specific behaviors, in this case inquiry skills, as modeled in a methods class. However, Denton (1982) found that early field experiences seem to have a greater effect on subsequent course achievement than on achievement in courses of which the field experience is part.

The influence of early field experiences on students' attitudes and concepts is another important area for research. Conradson (1973) found that students' attitudes toward teaching significantly improve as a result of early field experiences and that students develop a more realistic view of teaching. Harp (1974) investigated the relationship between early field experiences and the concerns of preservice students. This study revealed that a significant maturation in concerns from self-survival toward pupil-centered teaching occurs during early field experiences. However, evidence cited earlier (Copenhaver, McIntyre, and Norris 1981; Sacks and Harrington 1982) indicates that the preservice student, having completed early field experience, proceeds through these stages again in student teaching. A study by Austin-Martin, Bull, and Molrine (1981) revealed that early field experiences equip students to establish a more effective relationship with administrators, teachers, and pupils than do their counterparts who had no early field experience. Finally, Scherer (1979) discovered that students who participate in early field experiences have higher self-concepts than have nonparticipating counterparts, but that early field experiences do not relate to higher ratings of performance during student teaching. While these findings could result from poor evaluation procedures in both early field experiences and student teaching, they warrant further research.

In conclusion, despite potential problems, it appears that early field experiences affect positively students' self-concepts, attitudes toward teaching, and interpersonal skills. Moreover, early field experience appears to enhance the on-campus preservice program by helping students connect theory and practice. The model that relates early field experiences to a specific course or block of courses seems most helpful in this regard. However, Applegate and Lasley (1982) stressed that if teacher education institutions are to succeed in providing prospective teachers with the knowledge and skills needed for effective performance, the experiences provided in the classroom must correspond to the goals established for campus courses. Pending further research relating field experiences to professional performance, we may assume that early field experiences exert positive influence on preservice teachers.

Internships and Extended Programs

Current literature portrays internships as concentrated, postbaccalaureate teaching experiences, whereas extended programs consist of a year or two added to an existing preservice program. Neither concept is new in teacher education. Internships were a vital part of the education of teachers during the early 1900s. Traditionally, internships increase in number during severe teacher shortages because they represent a means of providing assistance to public schools and of recruiting teachers (Gardner 1968). However, current interest in internships and extended programs arises not from teacher shortage but from uncertainty concerning teacher preparation and the induction of first-year teachers.

Bergen (1978-79) stated that the reasons for recommending internships are rooted in the customary supervisory practices (or lack thereof) of new teachers. Too often, induction into teaching carries an implicit sink-or-swim ultimatum. Denemark and Nutter (1980) shared this belief, concluding that teachers do not receive a fully professional preservice education. They urged teacher educators to consider, "What should beginning teachers know and at what level of proficiency?," and then to determine the content and length of programs accordingly. Instead, "we now begin with a given program length and select content accordingly" (p. 3).

Internship and extended program models. Bents and Howey (1979) listed the following as characteristics of internships: (1) They occur after student teaching; (2) they are cooperatively planned and coordinated by an institution of higher learning and a public school; (3) interns are paid and under contract; (4) interns have a "carefully planned," limited teaching load; (5) interns are enrolled in college courses related to their teaching responsibilities; (6) internships last one year; (7) interns are supervised by teachers who are released for some amount of time to supervisory responsibilities; and (8) a college faculty member also supervises.

An example of one type of internship was the Teacher Corps program, which attempted to recruit more competent individuals, especially minorities, into teaching. Teacher Corps developed a modified, abbreviated program featuring an in-depth school/community internship and often replaced the traditional preservice program. However, discussion on internships has focused on their usefulness as transitions between teacher preparation and independent teaching (Van Til 1968). Such will be the focus of this discourse.

Denemark and Nutter (1980) recommended a six-year program of initial teacher preparation: five years of campus-based, but field-oriented, preparation followed by a sixth year of supervised internship and a provision for follow-up during the first year of regular employment. However, Bergen (1978-79) cautioned that the current emphasis on expanding preservice programs will benefit the profession only if it stresses analysis of experience. Preservice programs may actually miseducate if they fail to train students to observe classroom strategies in relation to the total problem of educating the child. Bergen also warned that teacher educators must never imply that the way to become a good teacher is simply to copy a good teacher.

Instead of adding one year to the preservice program, Imig (1981) suggested shifting to a continuous four- or five-year program. Such a program would engage students beginning in the junior year in college and concluding three or four years following the senior year. This program would include a series of teaching and learning activities spanning development from novice to experienced teacher and would culminate in a Master of Teaching degree.

Further, Imig suggested developing a cadre of interns who would commit themselves to two or three years in public schools as a national service.

Denemark and Nutter (1980) cited several issues that must be addressed before extended programs join the mainstream of teacher education: (1) Should teacher education become a graduate program? (2) How would extended programs affect minority and low income students? (3) What is the most appropriate blend of campus and field experiences? (4) How would extended programs affect liberal arts colleges without graduate programs? (5) Should teacher education be viewed as a professional school rather than as part of an academic unit? (6) What changes are necessary in teacher certification? and (7) How would extended programs influence a system of governance between the universities and public schools?

Problems of internships and extended programs. Internships and extended programs pose several problems. First, they may be costly. Funds must be acquired to pay interns or managers of extended programs (Lewis 1979; Gallegos 1981). Second, professional teacher organizations traditionally oppose reduced pay scales for interns, fearing that interns would replace certified teachers (Lewis 1979). Third, administrative complications threaten both internships and extended programs. For example, organizing an internship (procuring adequate pay, negotiating with unions, etc.) and providing adequate supervision for the interns may prove difficult. Further, the involvement of institutions without graduate programs may be limited (Lewis 1979).

As for extended programs, adding a year or two to preservice programs means increasing the number of university students in the public schools. Thus, Gallegos (1981) declared, universities with extended programs could align only with large school districts.

Another potential problem for both internships and extended programs is the university faculty itself. Rinehart and Leight (1981) stated that teacher educators have generally been content to make incremental improvements to traditional field programs rather than try dramatic innovations such as the internship. In addition, Gallegos (1981) reported that campus faculty balk at the extra time required for extended programs. However, the attitude of on- and off-campus colleagues improved markedly after the implementation of an extended program at the University of Kansas (Scannell and Guenther 1981). The effectiveness of internships and extended programs in developing more competent teachers remains fertile ground for research.

In conclusion, synthesis of the literature on program structures for field experiences uncovers controversy. The placement of students and the implementation of programs seem to result from convenience more often than from careful research and evaluation. Early field experiences seem to accomplish goals and have a positive effect on students, but some experts argue that such programs simply socialize students sooner and therefore should be eliminated. Finally, while interest has burgeoned in internships and extended programs as means of easing the transition from student teacher to independent teacher, critics warn that "more" may not be "better."

Evaluating the Student Teacher's Performance

Elliott and Mays (1979) charged that teacher educators shrink from telling prospective teachers that they are not good enough for the classroom, then wonder why so many of them fail in the schools. The public has expressed increasing dissatisfaction with the competence of many teachers. In general, the criticism has focused on poor preparation and lack of basic skills in English and math (Ellsworth, Krepelka, and Kear 1979). On the other hand, teacher preparation programs, though relatively lenient in admission standards, have harbored few academic drones (Gardner 1979). In response to the question of competence, this section concentrates on the evaluation of students' performance during field experiences and its impact on retention of learnings in the overall preservice program.

The problem of evaluating preservice student performance has little to do with the value teacher educators place on competence. All evaluators of novice teachers value teaching competence but each seems to have a highly personalized set of criteria for defining such competence (Tom 1974). Similarly, in a national survey of field experience directors, McIntyre and Norris (1980b) found considerable agreement among institutions on criteria for evaluation in preservice teacher education, yet the relative importance attached to each item varied markedly from one program to another. For instance, the researchers found that many field experience directors listed the criteria of classroom management and personal characteristics as either most or least important in student-teaching evaluation. Of course, this may indicate that institutions define these criteria differently.

Why are clinical faculty criticized for inability to evaluate student performance? Why do teacher educators disagree on the definition and relative importance of the skills and attitudes required of a competent teacher? The answer to both questions appears to be that educators do not agree on the "right" techniques for achieving objectives (Kliebard 1973; Mitchell 1976; Levstik 1982). Perhaps the problem stems from the resistance of the classroom to experimentation and investigation: Our notions about teaching swirl perpetually in a pretheoretical state that discourages agreement on the definition of teaching and requirements to make it successful (Diamonti 1977).

The lack of a research base for defining "good" teaching has encouraged an arbitrary approach to preservice teacher evaluation. For example, Vittetoe (1977) stated that evaluation during student teaching draws no clear distinction between outstanding and ineffective teaching. Diamonti (1977) suggested that the difficulty lies in evaluating and describing the performance of student teachers who fall between the extremes. Again, the evidence suggests that the lack of distinction between degrees of teaching

effectiveness results from lack of agreement about the skills that comprise good teaching.

Reliability of Clinical Faculty Evaluations. Disagreement about the definition of good teaching contributes to the poor articulation of evaluation criteria and procedures to those engaged in field experiences (Renihan and Schwier 1980). This, in turn, affects the reliability of the evaluations conducted by clinical faculty and cooperating teachers. Chiarelott et al. (1980) cautioned that public school administrators should view evaluations provided by clinical faculty and cooperating teachers with skepticism because of their consistent overrating of preservice student performance. Johnston and Hodge (1981) reemphasized this position, contending that cooperating teachers befriend their preservice students and therefore repress criticism. Fink's (1976) data that cooperating teachers tend to write positive evaluations of preservice students without having observed them support this view. In addition, Johnston and Hodge suggested that clinical faculty do not spend enough time observing the performance of the preservice student to collect valid data. Findings by McIntyre and Norris (1980b) indicating that university supervisors observe preservice students for approximately one hour every two weeks of a semester lend credence to this view.

Other evaluation criteria. Besides observation of teaching performance, what other criteria are used to evaluate preservice students and to what extent are they reliable? Levstik's (1982) research found that 85 percent of reporting institutions consider a student's grade-point average (g.p.a.) in the evaluation process. However, data conflict as to the degree of correlation between g.p.a. and a student's teaching ability. For example, Mackey et al. (1977) found g.p.a. to be an effective predictor of student-teaching performance for the variables of knowledge of subject matter, breadth of general information, and overall performance. On the other hand, Emanuel, Larimore, and Sagan (1975) reported that the quality of students' work in education courses or in their major or minor field is not significantly related to how well students perform in student teaching.

Reacting to such conflicting data, some educators (Twa and Greene 1980) have advocated the elimination of g.p.a. as a major criterion for predicting success in student teaching and thus for screening teacher education candidates. Instead, some (Gardner 1979; Twa and Greene 1980) have suggested that teacher preparation programs select students in part on psychological traits related more predictably to teaching success. Although this suggestion warrants consideration, one must remember that many institutions were not able to agree on the importance and definition of the criteria for the evaluation of teacher candidates. Thus, agreement concerning psychological traits that predict teaching success is unlikely.

Competency-based evaluation of field experiences. Recently, some field experience evaluators have adopted a competency-based approach founded on a specific set of low-inference teaching skills and attitudes and the criteria for attaining competence in those areas. Chiarelott et al. (1980) argued that noncompetency-based evaluation of teacher candidates is marred by high-inference data, and thus results in subjective evaluation. And Jensen (1975) asserted that the identification of specific and varied teaching tasks and the criteria for successfully completing those tasks contributes to team (clinical faculty and cooperating teacher) assessment and maximizes growth in preservice students. However, some disagree with competency-based evaluation.

Mitchell (1976) insisted that this approach to evaluation ignores knowledge about the relationship of teacher behaviors to pupil learning and about the interaction of people with their environment and overlooks the individuality of the teaching act.

Success of field experience evaluation as a screening process. It is difficult to determine the effectiveness of evaluation to screen incompetent candidates from the teaching profession, primarily because many students screen themselves out of teacher education. Levstik (1982) found that more students seem to drop out of teacher training in universities with early field experience programs before the institution has to take formal action on retention of the student. Vittetoe (1972) contended that most of the poor students who do not complete student teaching remove themselves from the program before the institution takes action. Thus, perhaps one reason clinical faculty have difficulty distinguishing between very good and very poor student teachers may be that most very poor students eliminate themselves from programs before student teaching. However, the question remains whether field experience evaluation is any less successful if students eliminate themselves from teaching before institutions do so. More to the point, would universities retain incompetent student teachers had those students not abandoned the program themselves?

Finally, the literature indicates that evaluation procedures and criteria used for field experiences are far from scientific and may fail to eliminate incompetent teachers. For this indispensable part of field experiences to succeed, teacher educators must know what is and what is not good teaching. Moreover, they must be willing to select and retain students on the basis of this knowledge. Until this occurs, many will doubt the reliability of the evaluation process, as well as the premises that support preservice programs.

Summary

Upon examination of the literature presented in this monograph, the reader must consider whether institutions of higher education have succeeded or failed in the development and implementation of field experiences. The verdict is not easily determined. As stated, an overwhelming percentage of undergraduates hold highly favorable attitudes toward their field experiences (Nosow 1975; Appleberry 1976; Haring and Nelson 1980). Yet, critics question the value of field work and suggest that it be drastically modified or even eliminated from teacher education (Friedenberg 1973; Lortie 1975; Clifton 1979). This summary reexamines the data that produce such divergent opinions and offers a fresh view of the effectiveness of field experiences.

The Field Experience as a Socializing Agent

A critical charge against field experiences is that they merely socialize preservice students into traditional teaching roles in existing school settings. Some data support this contention, indicating that at the conclusion of field work, novice teachers are more custodial; are more likely to hold less-than-favorable attitudes toward children, teaching, and schooling; and are less likely to focus on their pupils. Students' attitudes and behaviors seem to move toward those of their cooperating teachers. As a result, many educators (Friedenberg 1973; Lortie 1975; Salzillo and Van Fleet 1977; Clifton 1979) indict field experiences for simply adapting new teachers to old patterns.

However, we must study the data more closely. First, the acquired attitudes and behaviors of preservice students are not, in fact, negative. They merely become more negative, or less positive, than at the start of field experience. Alper and Retish (1972) suggested that this decline may reflect movement toward the mean, or toward more realistic attitudes about children, teaching, and schooling. It does not mean, as is often assumed, that higher education institutions produce teachers with negative attitudes.

Second, the role of field experiences and cooperating teachers as socializing agents has come under closer scrutiny. No doubt clinical experience is a socializing force, as it is in all professions. However, recent studies refute claims that preservice students blindly accept the beliefs and practices of their cooperating teachers so that they emerge from field experiences as replicas of those teachers. Research by Price (1961), Zeichner (1980), Egan (1982), and James, Etheridge, and Bryant (1982) clearly indicate that preservice students exert some control over the direction of socialization efforts and that some students wholly reject the dominant, conservative norms of public schools. Further, Lortie (1975) questioned whether field experiences substantially affect the development of teachers

(negatively or positively), pointing to the powerful effect of anticipatory socialization prior to formal teacher education. Lortie contended that the impact of formal teacher education, including field experiences, does little to overcome the effects of this prior socialization. Thus, Zeichner (1980) and Egan (1982) urged research to examine the personal ways in which preservice students interpret field experiences so that we might understand which students reject socialization and why.

Third, the research that serves as the basis for much of the criticism of field experiences must be viewed cautiously. Many of the studies gathered data using the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, an instrument of debatable validity (Zeichner 1978). In addition, Hook and Rosenshine (1979) questioned the relationship between self-report data, as used in these studies, and actual performance. In many cases, perceptions of attitudes and behavior may not accurately reflect actual attitudes and behavior.

In conclusion, current literature suggests that field experiences promote socialization, though perhaps not as pervasively as once thought, and that cooperating teachers are the chief socializers. Reflection may help moderate the effects of socialization by allowing students to develop personal perspectives on teaching (Jacobs 1968; Friedenberg 1973; Bergen 1978-79; Zeichner 1981). Certainly, institutions of higher education should provide formal opportunities for students to reflect on their field experiences. In any case, teacher educators cannot fairly condemn field experiences simply because they socialize.

Status of Clinical Faculty

It is clear from the literature that clinical faculty hold little prestige within or without the education community. Black (1976) and Bowman (1979) reported that university hierarchies rarely acknowledge the performance of clinical faculty and that, as a result, universities' reward systems do not apply to them.

What has caused this lack of commitment by the higher education hierarchy? Perhaps it is a misunderstanding of the role of clinicians, since on-campus teaching seems more highly valued than off-campus work (Wiles and Branch 1979). Clinical supervision is not yet universally viewed as teaching. Or, perhaps it is the result of teacher educators, including clinical faculty, who view teaching as their primary mission and as a result, produce little research (Yarger and Howey 1977).

Whatever the reasons, the relatively low status given clinical faculty presents an obstacle for field experience programs because faculty may find such programs not worth their commitment. This can have only negative consequences for both field experiences and the overall preservice program. If students, school teachers and administrators, and clinical faculty are to respect field experience, higher education must demonstrate commitment to it.

Cooperating Teacher as Teacher Trainer

Haberman (1971), Spillane and Levenson (1976), Diamonti (1977), and Bowman (1979) suggested that cooperating teachers assume full reponsibility for preservice students' training, thereby eliminating the university supervisor's role. However, in general, cooperating teachers do not seem to use or even possess the skills necessary to promote the growth of preservice

students (Fink 1976; Lynch and Kuehl 1979; Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott 1980). Higher education has failed to convey to public school personnel knowledge of good teaching practices and supervision. Indeed, McIntyre and Norris (1980b) reported that few universities offer formal training for cooperating teachers. Under these conditions, one cannot expect cooperating teachers to be skilled teacher trainers.

Control of Field Experiences

Lack of commitment has loosened higher education's control of field experience programs. At the same time, Kachur and Lang (1975) reported that teacher unions and schools are gaining influence over these programs. In addition, several states, such as Virginia and Illinois, have passed or are considering legislation that would enable prospective teachers to become certified without completing a university program. While teachers, schools, and legislatures always have had this power, they now exercise it more often, partly in response to higher education's failure to commit itself to field programs in teacher education.

Environments

Expedience, rather than knowledge and skill, seems the crucial factor in the selection of cooperating teachers. Higher education has not conducted the kind of extensive research on the effects of schools, cultures, and people (e.g., cooperating teachers, administrators) on the preservice student that would contribute to a more rational method of selecting cooperating teachers.

Early Field Experiences

Research indicates that early field experience succeeds in (1) allowing students to discover early if they like children and want to teach; (2) permitting universities to determine students' potential; (3) enabling students to practice instructional skills prior to student teaching; (4) developing the student's base of perceptions of classroom life; (5) improving communication between universities and public schools; and (6) accelerating passage through the stages from student to teacher. In addition, preservice students who participate in early field experiences show improved attitudes toward teaching.

Perhaps field study's greatest promise lies in the development of preservice programs linking methods courses with field work. This development would open possibilities for integrating theory and practice and for increasing preservice students' opportunities for reflection on teaching.

Evaluating Students' Performance

The literature indicates that field experience programs have failed to evaluate objectively the teaching performance of preservice students. Diamonti (1977) and Vittetoe (1977) described the difficulties in determining the relative quality in teaching performance. Lack of agreement as to what constitutes good teaching seems at least partly responsible for these

difficulties. Similarly, the reliability of evaluations conducted by clinical faculty and cooperating teachers is suspect because of the poor articulation of evaluation criteria and procedures.

New data are contributing to our understanding of teaching and of those behaviors that promote learning as measured by achievement test scores (e.g., Rosenshine 1971; Good 1979). Such data should form the foundation for all teacher training programs, and eventually result in universally accepted evaluation criteria and practices.

Competent Teachers?

Ultimately, one judges a field program on its ability to produce competent teachers, but until teacher education defines teaching competence and formulates a process for determining competence, such judgments must remain subjective. In the meantime we may ask, "Can institutions of higher education be expected to produce competent teachers?" Bergen (1978-79) warned against expecting too much from recent graduates. They need gradual induction into the profession and a reduced teaching load to give them time for study and preparation. Perhaps Giles put it best:

> It is not surprising that schools of education are criticized because they do not prepare a student to be an immediately competent practitioner in any setting or situation. The job of the school of education is not to provide trained teachers, but to screen, select, educate, and recommend persons who have the potential to become professional teachers. Students become competent professionals on the job, rather than in a training program. It is necessary that teacher education continue day after day in every classroom. If a teacher does not remain a continuous student of education throughout his career, the work of training programs becomes virtually useless. (1979, pp. 9-10)

Giles's refinement of the role of higher education to the selection and education of persons with teaching potential seems especially cogent considering that students normally spend only their junior and senior years in teacher training--hardly enough time to develop full competence.

The Effectiveness of Field Experience Programs

Synthesis of the literature leads one to agree with Zeichner's (1979) assertion that field experiences are neither all good nor all bad but rather produce both positive and negative results. Moreover, one cannot divorce field experience from the on-campus preservice program. If one component is strong and the other weak, the total preservice program cannot succeed.

However, it is clear that field experiences have fallen short of their potential. The lack of commitment from higher education, the low status of clinical faculty, the lack of objective evaluation criteria, the loss of control to teacher unions and state legislatures, and the lack of relationship between field and campus study threaten the survival of field experiences.

Recommendations for Future Field Experience Programs

With all its shortcomings, the field experience remains a valuable part of teacher education. However, major improvements must begin now if teacher education is to survive, let alone produce graduates with potential for excellence. This final section includes recommendations for improving field experience programs.

Theoretical Basis for Field Experience

One void in the field experience literature is the lack of emphasis on the theoretical bases for field work. It appears that field experiences evolved from early apprenticeship programs without examination of their purpose, nature, or length. Future study should focus on learning theory, curriculum theory, socialization theory, and developmental psychology as a means of testing the validity of current field experience programs. A solid rationale for field experience, steeped in professional/human development science, must emerge so that future improvements may be made on the basis of defensible theory.

An Inquiry-oriented Approach

This monograph has presented data indicating that, in general, preservice students adopt the attitudes and behaviors of their cooperating teachers. Zeichner (1981) argued that the "personalized" approach to field experiences contributes to this socialization process. Personalized programs attempt to respond to the needs and questions of preservice students at each stage of development. As Zeichner pointed out, "Given the largely survival oriented perspectives of student teachers, this would mean that the curriculum for student teaching should be constructed primarily with regard to helping student teachers survive, but within a context that is largely taken for granted" (p. 5). Thus, field experience becomes an apprenticeship accepted by students without examination or reflection (Price 1972).

To offset this tendency, Zeichner (1981) recommended an inquiry-oriented approach to field study, emphasizing inquiry about teaching and the settings in which teaching occurs. This does not mean that technical teaching skill is devalued; it is valued highly, but only as a means toward objectives, not as an objective itself.

Among the several researchers developing proposals for inquiry-oriented field experience, Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) proposed that universities reduce the time students actually teach and increase the time they study, through participant observation, the culture of the school and its

relationship to the community. By this means, preservice students experience the numerous ways schools and communities influence each other.

Zeichner (1981) described an inquiry-oriented approach to student teaching at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This program includes a 15-week field component and weekly seminars for student teachers. Specifically, preservice students conduct a "field study" focusing on experiences in a teacher's daily life. In the seminars, "students are asked to read and discuss materials related to providing an education in our schools that reflects that pluralistic nature of our society and that values this diversity" (p. 12). Then, following classroom observation by university supervisors, students are asked to relate their classroom experiences to issues discussed in seminars.

The inquiry-oriented approach (and this author) reject the notion that students become good teachers merely by teaching. While encouraging acquisition of teaching skills, the approach provides preservice students opportunities to develop personal perspectives on teaching, schooling, children, and themselves as teachers without becoming mere replicas of their cooperating teachers.

Early Field Experiences

Early field experiences are integral to teacher education (Ishler and Kay 1981). For this reason, some researchers have recommended that early field experiences be allowed to evolve only as part of content or generic methods courses (Seiferth and Samuel 1979; Krutstchinsky and Moore 1981). Under such a program, students would spend much time observing children and teachers and reflecting upon the art of teaching. On the other hand, if program planners adopt the philosophy that students become good teachers only by teaching--that reflection is a luxury, not a necessity--then early field experiences will never fulfill their potential.

Internships and Extended Programs

Universities should consider developing internships or extended programs (Bents and Howey 1979; Denemark and Nutter 1980; Imig 1981). In an internship, the university continues assisting the novice teacher through his or her induction into the profession. Ideally, the beginning teacher would be assigned a reduced teaching load, supplemented by the guidance of a full-time university supervisor and participation in weekly seminars emphasizing analysis of teaching.

To create an extended program, a university might add a year to its current preservice program, as did the University of Kansas (Scannell and Guenther 1981), thus giving students two full years of field experience. Both internships and extended programs should adopt an inquiry approach.

Clinical Faculty

Every teacher education program should establish a clearly defined clinical professorship. The clinical faculty would (1) work in the public schools, (2) be assigned full time to clinical experiences, (3) be knowledgeable about teaching, (4) supervise effectively, and (5) provide both

preservice and inservice assistance. A growing body of literature (Herbster 1975; Nance 1977; Freeland 1978; Quisenberry, Quisenberry, and Willis 1978) supports the clinical faculty model as most effective in promoting growth in the novice teacher, bridging the theory-practice gap, and improving communication between campus and school.

Teaching Centers

Clinical faculty function best in field programs organized according to the teaching center model. A teaching center consists of a school district or districts to which preservice students are assigned. Each center employs a clinician responsible for assisting both students and cooperating teachers. Gardner (1979), McIntyre (1979a), and McIntyre and Vickery (1979) cited the advantages that teaching centers offer both universities and public schools.

Training Cooperating Teachers

The literature indicates clearly that the interaction of cooperating teachers and preservice students is one of the most powerful aspects of the field experience. However, in many preservice programs, cooperating teachers receive training only in the area of teaching skills, not in analyzing or explaining teaching. Moreover, McIntyre and Norris (1980b) reported that most cooperating teachers receive that training through informational meetings or printed materials. To improve the performance of cooperating teachers, institutions of higher education should train all cooperating teachers as teacher educators, providing at least one formal, postbaccalaureate course on the supervision of preservice students.

Knowledge-based Evaluation Techniques

We must develop effective and objective criteria and techniques for the evaluation of students' work in the field. In the last decade, teacher education has made great strides in acquiring knowledge about teaching and learning. Either we, as clinicians, are unaware of this literature, as Haberman (1971) suggested, or we ignore it.

Evaluation criteria applied to field experiences must be based on our knowledge of teaching and learning. In addition, clinical faculty must be willing to screen incompetent students from teacher training programs.

Interaction of School and Setting

The settings in which students perform field study bear critically on their development as teachers. As Copeland (1977) stated, the major influence on a student's acquisition of skills is the ecological system of the classroom. Too often, procedures for determining field sites and placement seem skewed toward convenience rather than toward finding schools with the best experience in working with preservice students.

Lack of knowledge about the interaction of students and field settings may contribute to this situation. Teacher education research should investigate the relationship of the field setting to growth in the novice

teacher, concentrating on the following questions: How do people, schools, and cultures affect preservice students? Do students placed in settings congruent with their backgrounds experience less difficulty and more growth than students placed in unfamiliar settings? Do students placed with one cooperating teacher experience less difficulty and more growth than students placed with a group of cooperating teachers? Answers to these questions will aid the development of a more intelligent approach to site selection and student placement.

Socialization

The issue of teacher socialization needs further research. Zeichner (1980) and Egan's (1982) work on students' assimilation of experiences in the field should serve as models for future studies. In addition, longitudinal studies that follow the student from the start of formal training through beginning teaching may yield a deeper understanding of socialization.

Number of Teacher Training Institutions

Size, location, or other factors will prevent some teacher training institutions from acting upon these recommendations. Not all institutions will be able to develop teacher education centers, extended or internship programs, clinical professorships, etc. Thus, perhaps the profession should consider reducing the number of institutions accredited for teacher education. In fact, Monahan (1977) maintained that no more than 200 institutions in the United States are truly capable of educating teachers competently.

Further, Monahan stated that no community college should be authorized to prepare teachers to any extent since this preparation is beyond their capability. The fact that community colleges are involved in teacher education, he charged, further demonstrates the lack of sophistication of the teaching profession.

Goal of Preservice Teacher Education Programs

Can we expect to produce competent teachers given current programs? Is the teaching process so complicated now that current programs are inadequate? If we cannot certify the competence of each graduate, then we must reexamine the ultimate goal of preservice teacher education and make the necessary changes in course and organization, no matter how bold.

If, on the other hand, the goal of preservice teacher education programs is to recommend persons who have the potential to be competent teachers, as Giles (1979) suggested, then we must examine carefully the systems that deliver inservice training. Thus, the period of induction from student to teacher becomes crucial and a major focus of teacher training institutions.

Consensus on this issue is essential. If we are not graduating competent teachers, then much of the criticism of teacher education may be valid. However, if our goal is to graduate students with the potential to become competent teachers, then we must develop inservice programs that enhance competence. In addition, the public must be aware of this goal so that it has a better understanding of the mission of teacher education.

Conclusion

This monograph offers the following recommendations for future field programs:

1. A theoretical base, incorporating information from other disciplines, should be established in order to strengthen field experience programs.

2. Field programs should adopt an inquiry-oriented approach, fostering thoughtful examination of teaching and the settings in which teaching occurs.

3. Early field experience programs should accompany content or generic methods courses and encourage students to reflect on teaching.

4. Institutions of higher education should consider developing internships or extended programs in order to support novice teachers throughout the process of becoming a teacher.

5. Institutions of higher education should adopt the clinical faculty model in order to provide effective supervision of preservice students.

6. Institutions of higher education should adopt the teaching center as the model for field programs.

7. All cooperating teachers should receive formal instruction in supervisory skills and analysis of teaching.

8. The criteria for evaluating students' field work should be based on knowledge about teaching and learning.

9. Research should explore the influence of school settings on the growth of novice teachers.

10. Research on the process of socialization should continue.

11. The teacher education profession should eliminate all teacher training programs except those that are truly competent.

12. Teacher education must clarify its ultimate goal. Do we seek to graduate competent teachers or potentially competent teachers?

We must address these issues now. Otherwise, control over field experience will fall to state legislators and teacher unions. Without timely action, higher education will regress from leader to impotent observer in teacher education.

References

Appleberry, Mary. "What Did You Learn from Student Teaching?" Instructor 85, 6 (February 1976):38-40. (ERIC No. EJ 138 842.)

Applegate, Jane, and Lasley, Thomas J. "Cooperating Teachers' Problems with Preservice Field Experience Students." Journal of Teacher Education 33, 2 (March-April 1982):15-18. (ERIC No. EJ 263 778)

Alper, Sandra, and Retish, Paul M. "A Comparative Study on the Effects of Student Teaching on the Attitudes of Students in Special Education, Elementary Education, and Secondary Education." The Training School Bulletin 69, 2 (August 1972):70-7.

Association of Teacher Educators. Guidelines to Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education. Position Paper 3. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 722.)

Austin-Martin, George; Bull, Diana; and Molrine, Charlotte. "A Study of the Effectiveness of a Pre-Student Teaching Experience in Promoting Positive Attitudes Toward Teaching." Peabody Journal of Education 58, 3 (April 1981):148-53. (ERIC No. EJ 244 880.)

Barnett, Don C. "The Emergence of New Concepts for Teacher Education Field Experience." Interchange 6, 1 (Spring 1975):44-8. (ERIC No. EJ 138 736.)

Becker, Rhoda M., and Ade, William E. "The Relationship of Field Placement Characteristics and Students' Potential Field Performance Abilities to Clinical Experience Performance Ratings." Journal of Teacher Education 33, 2 (March-April 1982):24-30. (ERIC No. EJ 263 780.)

Bennie, William A. "Campus Supervision of Student Teachers: A Closer Look." Teachers College Journal 36, 3 (December 1964):131-3.

_____. "The Prologue of the Past." Action in Teacher Education 1, 1 (Summer 1978):3-7. (ERIC No. EJ 189 531.)

Bents, Richard A., and Howey, Kenneth R. "A Historical Perspective." In Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher, edited by Kenneth R. Howey and Richard A. Bents, pp. 7-18. Minneapolis, Minn.: Midwest Teacher Corps Network and University of Minnesota/St. Paul Schools Teacher Corps Project, 1979.

Bergen, Timothy J., Jr. "Internships in Professional Education: Irreconcilable Differences?" Illinois Schools Journal 58, 4 (Winter 1978-79):28-32. (ERIC No. EJ 200 647.)

Black, Donald R. "The Re-Organization of Teacher Preparation Experiences: A Modest Proposal." Journal of Educational Thought 10, 2 (August 1976):126-31. (ERIC No. EJ 152 760.)

Bowman, Novy. "College Supervision of Student Teaching: A Time to Reconsider." Journal of Teacher Education 30, 3 (May-June 1979):29-30. (ERIC No. EJ 208 609.)

Bredemeier, Nancy; Kindsvatter, Richard; and Wilen, William W. "A Conceptualization of the Clinical Professorship." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1975, New Orleans, La. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 532.)

Brosio, Richard A. "The Supervision of Teacher Candidates: A Philosophical/Historical Perspective." Teacher Educator 11, 2 (Fall 1975):25-40. (ERIC No. EJ 136 973.)

Burden, Paul R. "Implications of Teacher Career Development: New Roles for Teachers, Administrators, and Professors." Paper presented at the annual summer workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, August 1982, Slippery Rock, Pa.

Burns, W.J.; Cosiano, Patrick; Fox, Edward J.; Kaufman, Joanne; and Vakil, Rama. "Teacher Education Centers: Do They Help Student Teachers Attain Their Learning Goals?" Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 084 257.)

Caruso, Joseph J. "Phases in Student Teaching." Young Children 33, 1 (November 1977):57-63. (ERIC No. EJ 172 317.)

Casey, John P., and McNeil, Keith. "Attitudinal Dimensions of Supervising Teachers and of Elementary and Secondary Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 23, 3 (Fall 1972):358-62. (ERIC No. EJ 066 293.)

Chiarelott, Leigh; Davidman, Leonard; and Muse, Corey. "Evaluating Pre-Service Teacher Candidates." Clearing House 53, 6 (February 1980):295-9. (ERIC No. EJ 226 919.)

Clifton, Rodney A. "Practice Teaching: Survival in a Marginal Situation." Canadian Journal of Education 4, 3 (March 1979):60-74. (ERIC No. EJ 213 629.)

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Conradson, Diane R. "The Effect of Early Classroom Teaching Experience Upon the Attitudes and Performance of Science Teacher Candidates." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, March 1973, Detroit, Mich. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 080 322.)

Copeland, Willis D. "The Nature of the Relationship Between Cooperating Teacher Behavior and Student Teacher Classroom Performance." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1977, New York, N.Y. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 271.)

_____, and Boyan, Norman. "Training in Instructional Supervision: Improving the Influence of the Cooperating Teacher." In Developing Supervisory Practice. Bulletin No. 41, edited by Ruth Heidelbach, pp. 28-38. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113 327.)

Copenhaver, Ron W.; McIntyre, D. John; and Norris, William R. "Preservice Teachers' Reflections on the Instructional Process." Peabody Journal of Education 59, 1 (October 1981):30-6.

Corrigan, Dean, and Griswold, Kenneth. "Attitude Change of Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research 57, 2 (October 1963):93-5.

Coss, Albert. "A Comparative Analysis of the Expressed Attitudes of Elementary Education Student Teachers, Their University Instructors, and Their Supervising Teachers Toward Pupil-Teacher Relations as Measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.

Denemark, George, and Nutter, Norma. "The Case for Extended Programs of Initial Teacher Preparation." Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 180 995.)

Denton, Jon J. "Early Field Experience Influence on Performance in Subsequent Coursework." Journal of Teacher Education 33, 2 (March-April 1982):19-23. (ERIC No. EJ 263 779.)

Diamonti, Michael C. "Student Teacher Supervision." Educational Forum 41, 4 (May 1977):477-86. (ERIC No. EJ 163 579.)

Dispoto, Raymond G. "Affective Changes Associated with Student Teaching." College Student Journal 14, 2 (Summer 1980):190-4. (ERIC No. EJ 223 079.)

Dunham, Charles. "Field Attitudes of Student Teachers, College Supervisors, and Student Teachers Toward Youth." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.

Dutton, Wilbur H. "Attitude and Anxiety Change of Elementary School Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research 55, 6 (May 1962):380-2.

Egan, Kathleen B. "Carol, Laurie and Rita: Three Persons in the Act of Becoming Teachers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 19-23 March 1982, New York, N.Y. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 006.)

Elliott, Peggy G., and Draba, Robert E. "A Placement Procedure That Prevents Problems." Clearing House 52, 4 (December 1978):157-60. (ERIC No. EJ 199 106.)

Elliott, Peggy G., and Mays, Robert E. Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education. Fastback 125. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Foundation, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 171 713.)

Ellsworth, Randy; Krepelka, Ernie; and Kear, Dennis. "Teacher Education and Dilemmas of Selecting Students for Teacher Training." Teacher Educator 15, 1 (Summer 1979):21-31. (ERIC No. EJ 213 493.)

Emanuel, Jane; Larimore, David; and Sagan, Edgar. "The Relation of Selected Academic Program Variables to Student Teaching Performance." Contemporary Education 46, 4 (Summer 1975):245-8. (ERIC No. EJ 133 606.)

Fink, Cecelia H. "Social Studies Student Teachers--What Do They Really Learn?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, 4-7 November 1976, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 134 493.)

Freeland, Kent. "Assessing Student Teaching." Teacher Educator 15, 2 (Autumn 1979):11-16. (ERIC No. EJ 226 584.)

Friebus, Robert J. "Agents of Socialization Involved in Student Teaching." Journal of Educational Research 70, 5 (May-June 1977):263-8. (ERIC No. EJ 168 755.)

Friedenberg, Edgar Z. "Critique of Current Practice." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty and Associates, pp. 52-72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Gallegos, Arnold M. "The Dilemma of Extended/Five Year Programs." Journal of Teacher Education 32, 1 (January-February 1981):4-6. (ERIC No. EJ 244 803.)

Gardner, Harrison. Internships in Teacher Education: Forty-Seventh Yearbook, 1968. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 028 973.)

Gardner, William. "Dean's Perspective of Support for Teachers in the Beginning Years." In Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher, edited by Kenneth R. Howey and Richard H. Bents, pp. 95-110. Minneapolis, Minn.: Midwest Teacher Corps Network and the University of Minnesota/St. Paul Schools Teacher Corps Project, 1979.

Gehrke, Natalie. "Rationales for Field Experiences in the Professions." In Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, edited by Clark Webb, Natalie Gehrke, Peggy Ishler, and Alicia Mendoza, pp. 1-6. Reston, Va.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 482.)

Giles, Frederic T. "Schools of Education: An Investment in the Present and Future." 20th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture, presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 27 February 1979, Chicago, Ill. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 185 046.)

Good, Thomas L. "Teacher Effectiveness in the Elementary School." Journal of Teacher Education 30, 2 (March-April 1979):52-64. (ERIC No. EJ 205 612.)

Haberman, Martin. "Twenty-three Reasons Universities Can't Educate Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 22, 2 (Summer 1971):133-40. (ERIC No. EJ 040 571.)

Haring, Marilyn J., and Nelson, Edward A. "A Five Year Followup Comparison of Recent and Experienced Graduates from Campus- and Field-Based Teacher Education Programs." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1980, Boston, Mass. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 186 429.)

Harp, William M. "Early Field Experiences--A Maturing Force." Elementary School Journal 74, 6 (March 1974):369-74. (ERIC No. EJ 098 280.)

Henry, Marvin A. The Comfortable Unrealities of Student Teaching. Occasional Paper No. 8. Independence: Association of Teacher Educators, Missouri Unit, July 1976.

_____, and Sa'ad, Farouk F. "The Impact of Field Experience on Student Teachers' Perceptions of Good and Poor Teaching." Teacher Educator 13, 2 (Fall 1977):18-22. (ERIC No. EJ 174 573.)

Herbster, Douglas L. "Generalists vs. Specialists in the Supervision of Student Teachers." Teacher Educator 11, 3 (Winter 1975-76):32-4. (ERIC No. EJ 143 858.)

Hook, Colin M., and Rosenshine, Barak V. "Accuracy of Teacher Reports of Their Classroom Behavior." Review of Educational Research 49, 1 (Winter 1979):1-11. (ERIC No. EJ 205 650.)

Howey, Kenneth R. "Preservice Teacher Education: Lost in the Shuffle?" Journal of Teacher Education 28, 6 (November-December 1977):26-8. (ERIC No. EJ 172 770.)

Hoy, Wayne. "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Educational Research 61, 4 (December 1967):153-5.

_____. "The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher." School Review 76, 4 (Winter 1968):312-23.

_____. "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: A Further Examination of the Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher." School Review 77, 3-4 (Spetember-December 1969):257-65. (ERIC No. EJ 010 678.)

Iannaccone, Laurence. "Student Teaching: A Transitional Stage in the Making of a Teacher." Theory Into Practice 12, 2 (Summer 1963):73-80.

_____, and Button, Henry. Functions of Student Teaching: Attitude Formation, and Initiation in Elementary Student Teaching. CRP Project 1026. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1964. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 003 011.)

Imig, David G. "The Future of Teacher Education: Who Is Going to Staff the Nation's Schools?" Ninth Annual George S. Counts Lecture, 28 April 1981, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill. Photocopied.

Ishler, Peggy, and Kay, Richard S. "A Survey of Institutional Practice." In Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, edited by Clark Webb, Natalie Gehrke, Peggy Ishler, and Alicia Mendoza, pp. 15-22. Reston, Va.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 482.)

Jacobs, Elmer B. "Attitude Change in Teacher Education: An Inquiry into the Role of Attitudes in Changing Teacher Behavior." Journal of Education 19, 4 (Winter 1968):410-16.

James, Terry L.; Etheridge, George W.; and Bryant, Gregory W. "The Effect of Student Teaching on Elementary Majors' Beliefs About Discipline." Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators' Mid-America Mini-Clinic, April 1982, Columbia, Mo. Photocopied.

Jensen, Julie M. "PBTE: Finding the Baby in the Bathwater." English Education 7, 1 (Fall 1975):46-9. (ERIC No. EJ 135 989.)

Johnson, James S. "Change in Student Teacher Dogmatism." Journal of Educational Research 62, 5 (January 1969):224-6. (ERIC No. EJ 001 594.)

Johnston, John M., and Hodge, R. Lewis. "Self-Evaluation through Performance Statements--A Basis for Professional Development." Journal of Teacher Education 32, 6 (November-December 1981):30-3. (ERIC No. EJ 258 727.)

Kachur, Donald S., and Lang, Duaine C. "Negotiating Clinical Experiences: Do the Colleges and Universities Want In?" Journal of Teacher Education 26, 3 (Fall 1975):202-5. (ERIC No. EJ 124 993.)

Karmos, Ann H., and Jacko, Carol M. "The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience." Journal of Teacher Education 28, 5 (September-October 1977):51-5. (ERIC No. EJ 170 673.)

Katz, Lilian G.; Raths, James D.; Irving, Joyce; Kurachi, Akemi; Mohanty, Chandra; and Sani, Mara. "Reputations of Teacher Educators Among Members of Their Role-Set." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1982, New York, N.Y. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 486.)

Kay, Richard S., and Ishler, Margaret F. "Exploratory Field Experiences Survey: Investigating Field Sites and Field Trainers." Action in Teacher Education 2, 3 (Summer 1980):61-6. (ERIC No. EJ 235 434.)

Kliebard, Herbert M. "The Question in Teacher Education." In New Perspectives on Teacher Education, edited by Donald J. McCarty and Associates, pp. 8-24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Kline, William A., and Dale, Lawrence. "A Modest Proposal for Changing Teacher Education." Teachers College Record 77, 1 (September 1975):99-106. (ERIC No. EJ 136 997.)

Krutstchinsky, Rick, and Moore, Bobby D. "Early Field Experiences: A Vital Part in the Training of Elementary Teachers." Kappa Delta Pi Record 17, 4 (April 1981):119-20. (ERIC No. EJ 245 199.)

Lacey, Charles. The Socialization of Teachers. London, England: Methean, 1977.

Leslie, Larry L. Some Relationships Between Student Teachers' Perceptions of Cooperating Teachers and Changes in Student Teachers. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 051 128.)

Levstik, Linda S. "Teacher Education Selection and Retention Considerations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, March 1982, New York, N.Y. Photocopied.

Lewis, Carol. "Some Essential Characteristics of Programs to Support Teachers in the Beginning Years." In Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher, edited by Kenneth R. Howey and Richard H. Bents, pp. 53-66. Minneapolis, Minn.: Midwest Teacher Corps Network and University of Minnesota/St. Paul Schools Teacher Corps Project, 1979.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lynch, H. Lewis, and Kuehl, Ray. "Recent Graduates Have Definite Ideas on How to Improve Teacher Education Programs." Teacher Educator 15, 3 (Winter 1979-80):16-21. (ERIC No. EJ 226 564.)

Mackey, James A.; Blackmon, C. Robert; and Andrews, Jerry W. "Does Academic Achievement Make a Difference in Student Teaching?" Phi Delta Kappan 59, 4 (December 1977):272-3. (ERIC No. EJ 169 794.)

MacNaughton, Robert; Johns, Frank; and Rogus, Joseph. "Alternative Models for Revitalizing the School-University Partnership." Action in Teacher Education 1, 1 (Summer 1978):18-29. (ERIC No. EJ 189 533.)

Mahan, James M. "Influences of Supervising Teachers in a Cluster Program." Teacher Educator 12, 3 (Winter 1976-77):2-6. (ERIC No. EJ 157 765.)

_____, and Lacefield, Warren E. "Changes in Preservice Teachers' Value Orientations Toward Education During Year-Long, Cluster, Student Teaching Placements." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 19-23 April 1976, San Francisco, Calif. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 124 534.)

Manning, Diane Thompson. "The Influence of Key Individuals on Student Teachers in Urban and Suburban Settings." Teacher Educator 13, 2 (February 1977):2-8. (ERIC No. EJ 174 570.)

McIntyre, D. John. "Integrating Theory and Practice Via a Teaching Center." Contemporary Education 50, 3 (Spring 1979a):146-9. (ERIC No. EJ 208 688.)

_____. "The Impact of Field-Based Teacher Education Programs in Public Schools." Journal of Teaching and Learning 4, 2 (August 1979b):15 ...

_____; Casey, John P.; and Buell, Michaele A. "Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers." College Student Journal 13, 3 (Fall 1979):240-4. (ERIC No. EJ 210 525.)

McIntyre D. John; Copenhaver, Ron W.; Jacko, Carol M.; and O'Bryan, Sharon. "Pupils' Perceptions of the Influence of Preservice Teachers on Classroom Environment." Teacher Educator 17, 4 (Spring 1982):2-7. (ERIC No. EJ 262 542.)

McIntyre, D. John, and Norris, William R. "Research on the Student Teaching Triad." Contemporary Education 51, 4 (Summer 1980a):193-6. (ERIC No. EJ 235 449.)

_____. "The State of the Art of Pre-Service Teacher Education Programs and Supervision of Field Experiences." Action in Teacher Education 2, 3 (Summer 1980b):67-9. (ERIC No. EJ 235 435.)

McIntyre, D. John, and Vickery, Tom Rusk. "Differential Observer Effects on Student Teacher Verbal Behavior." College Student Journal 13, 3 (Fall 1979):263-7. (ERIC No. EJ 210 530.)

Merwin, William C., and Templeton, Ronald. "Methods Course in the Field." Clearing House 48, 3 (November 1973):159-62. (ERIC No. EJ 089 039.)

Mitchell, James V., Jr. "The Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs: Conceptual Dimensions and Implications from Research." Teacher Educator 12, 2 (Autumn 1976):2-10. (ERIC No. EJ 155 956.)

Monahan, William G. "Some Straight-Talk About Teacher Preparation." Educational Leadership 35, 3 (December 1977):202-4. (ERIC No. EJ 171 493.)

Morris, June R. "The Effects of the University Supervisor on the Performance and Adjustment of Student Teachers." Journal of Educational Research 67, 8 (April 1974):358-62. (ERIC No. EJ 097 038.)

Nance, Douglas W. "An Academic Department Member's Perception of a Student Teaching Program." Teacher Educator 12, 4 (Spring 1977):18-21. (ERIC No. EJ 166 790.)

Nosow, Sigmund. "Students' Perceptions of Field Experience Education." Journal of College Student Personnel 16, 6 (November 1975):508-13. (ERIC No. EJ 132 309.)

Perrodin, Alex F. "In Support of Supervising Teacher Education Programs." Journal of Teacher Education 12, 1 (March 1961):36-8.

Peterson, Gerald L. "Belief and Judgment 'Policies' in Student Teaching: Institutional Differences and the Distribution of Knowledge." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, 5-7 May 1977, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 142 534.)

Price, Robert D. "The Influence of Supervising Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 12, 1 (December 1961):471-5.

Price, William J. "The Student Teacher as Indentured Servant." Journal of Teacher Education 23, 3 (Fall 1972):352-4. (ERIC No. EJ 067 090.)

Quisenberry, Nancy L.; Quisenberry, James D.; and Willis, Margo. "An Evaluation of the Southern Illinois University-Carbondale Center Approach to Professional Education Experiences." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1978, Las Vegas, Nev. Photocopied.

Renihan, Patrick J., and Schwier, Richard A. "Ten Recurring Ailments in Field Experience Programs." Education Canada 20, 3 (Fall 1980):22-7. (ERIC No. EJ 232 805.)

Rinehart, Alice D., and Leight, Robert L. "The Teaching Internship: An Opportunity Missed." Clearing House 54, 6 (February 1981):278-81. (ERIC No. EJ 241 717.)

Roberts, Richard A., and Blankenship, Jacob W. "The Relationship Between the Change in Pupil Control Ideology of Student Teachers and the Student Teacher's Perception of the Cooperating Teacher's Pupil Control Ideology." Journal of Research in Science Teaching 7, 4 (Winter 1970):315-20. (ERIC No. EJ 034 786.)

Rosenshine, Barak V. Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. London, England: National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971.

Sacks, Susan R., and Harrington, Giselle. "Student to Teacher: The Process of Role Transition." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1982, New York, N.Y. Photocopied.

Salzillo, Frederik E., Jr., and Van Fleet, Alanson A. "Student Teaching and Teacher Education: A Sociological Model for Change." Journal of Teacher Education 28, 1 (January-February 1977):27-31. (ERIC No. EJ 159 703.)

Sandberg, John H. "A Moral Dilemma for Teacher Educators." Educational Forum 42, 4 (May 1978):483-8. (ERIC No. EJ 184 466.)

Sandgren, Duane L., and Schmidt, Louis G. "Does Practice Teaching Change Attitudes Toward Teaching?" Journal of Educational Research 50, 8 (May 1956):673-80.

Scannell, Dale P., and Guenther, John E. "The Development of an Extended Program." Journal of Teacher Education 32, 1 (January-February 1981):7-12. (ERIC No. EJ 244 804.)

Scherer, Charlotte. "Effects of Early Field Experiences on Student Teachers' Self-Concepts and Performance." Journal of Experimental Education 47, 3 (Spring 1979):208-14. (ERIC No. EJ 220 255.)

Schoenrock, Fred. "Student Teaching--An Entrenching 'Knowing That' and 'Knowing How.'" Elements: Translating Theory Into Practice 11, 6 (February 1980):3-4. (ERIC No. EJ 224 206.)

Schueler, Robert; Gold, Barbara; and Mitzel, Harold. Improvement of Student Teaching. New York: City University of New York, Hunter College, 1962.

Scott, Owen, and Brinkley, Sterling G. "Attitude Changes in Student Teachers and Validity of the MTAI." Journal of Educational Psychology 51, 4 (April 1960):76-81.

Seiferth, Berniece, and Samuel, Marie. "The Emergence of Early Field Experiences." Peabody Journal of Education 57, 1 (October 1979):10-16. (ERIC No. EJ 226 590.)

Shuman, R. Baird. "A New Model is Needed in Teacher Training." Clearing House 47, 2 (October 1972):120-4. (ERIC No. EJ 066 125.)

Spillane, Robert R., and Levenson, Dorothy. "Teacher Training: A Question of Control, Not Content." Phi Delta Kappan 57, 7 (March 1976):435-9. (ERIC No. EJ 132 522.)

Sunal, Dennis W. "Effect of Field Experiences During Elementary Methods Courses on Preservice Teacher Behavior." Journal of Research in Science Teaching 17, 1 (January 1980):17-23. (ERIC No. EJ 218 411.)

Tabachnick, B. Robert; Popkewitz, Thomas S.; and Zeichner, Kenneth M. "Teacher Education and Professional Perspectives of Student Teachers." Interchange on Educational Policy 10, 4 (Winter 1979-80):12-29. (ERIC No. EJ 233 075.)

Tabachnick, B. Robert; Zeichner, Kenneth M.; Densmore, Kathleen; Adler, Susan; and Egan, Kathleen. "The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1982, New York, N.Y. Photocopied.

Tom, Alan R. "The Case for Pass/Fail Student Teaching." Teacher Educator 10, 1 (Fall 1974):2-8. (ERIC No. EJ 108 273.)

_____. "Student Teaching: First Course in Teacher Education?" In Teacher Education Forum 4, 5. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, School of Education, March 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 300.)

Twa, R. Jim, and Greene, Myrna. "Prediction of Success in Student Teaching as a Criterion for Selection in Teacher Education Programs." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 26, 1 (March 1980):1-13. (ERIC No. EJ 224 230.)

Van Til, William. The Year 2000: Teacher Education. Terre Haute, Ind.: Indiana State University, 1968.

Vickery, Tom Rusk, Jr., and Brown, Bob. "Descriptive Profiles of Beliefs of Teachers." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1967, New York, N.Y. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 011 258.)

Villeme, Melvin G., and Hall, Bruce. "Professional Education Programs' Effects of the Attitudes of Prospective Teachers." Humanist Educator 14, 2 (December 1975):64-70. (ERIC No. EJ 129 100.)

Vittetoe, Jack O. "Evaluation of Product--An Essential First Step." Journal of Teacher Education 23, 2 (Summer 1972):129-33. (ERIC No. EJ 064 611.)

Warner, Allen R.; Cooper, James M.; Houston, W. Robert; Rabenow, Kathryn L.E.; Johnston, Janet; Stell, Eugenia A.; and Turner, Sharon, eds. Clinical Experiences and Clinical Practice in Professional Education. Houston, Tex.: Houston University Teacher Center, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 123 209.)

Warner, Allen R.; Cooper, James M.; and Houston, W. Robert. "Rethinking the Clinical Concept in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 28, 1 (January-February 1977):15-18. (ERIC No. EJ 159 699.)

Wilbur, Paul H., and Gooding, C. Thomas. "Attitude Changes in Student Teachers." College Student Journal 11, 3 (Fall 1977):227-31. (ERIC No. EJ 169 266.)

Wiles, Marilyn M., and Branch, Jan. "University-Public School Collaboration Models in Teacher Education." Educational Forum 44, 1 (November 1979):35-43. (ERIC No. EJ 220 647.)

Williamson, John A., and Campbell, Lloyd P. "The Student Teaching Experience Results in Greater Emphasis on Pupil Control." Southern Journal of Educational Research 12, 1 (Winter 1978):1-6. (ERIC No. EJ 178 205.)

Yarger, Sam J., and Howey, Kenneth. "Reflections on Preservice Preparation: Impressions from the National Survey. Part 2. Students and Faculty." Journal of Teacher Education 28, 6 (November-December 1977):34-7. (ERIC No. EJ 172 772.)

Yee, Albert. "Do Cooperating Teachers Influence the Attitudes of Student Teachers?" Journal of Educational Psychology 60, 4 (August 1969):327-32. (ERIC No. EJ 006 820.)

Zeichner, Kenneth M. "Student Teaching Experience: A Methodological Critique of the Research." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1978, Las Vegas, Nev. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 166 145.)

_____. "The Dialectics of Teacher Socialization." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1979, Orlando, Fla. Photocopied.

_____. "Myths and Realities: Field-Based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 31, 6 (November-December 1980):45-9, 51-5. (ERIC No. EJ 239 500.)

_____. "Ethical Problems in 'Personalizing' Instruction During the Student Teaching Experience." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, February 1981, Dallas, Tex. Photocopied.

_____, and Grant, Carl A. "Biography and Social Structure in the Socialization of Student Teachers: A Re-examination of the Pupil Control Ideologies of Student Teachers." Journal of Education for Teaching 7, 3 (October 1981):298-314. (ERIC No. EJ 254 411.)

Zeichner, Kenneth M., and Tabachnick, B. Robert. "Are the Effects of University Teacher Education 'Washed Out' by School Experience?" Journal of Teacher Education 32, 3 (May-June 1981):7-11. (ERIC No. EJ 249 372.)

Zimpher, Nancy L.; deVoss, Gary G.; and Nott, Deborah L. "A Closer Look at University Student Teacher Supervision." Journal of Teacher Education 31, 4 (July-August 1980):11-15. (ERIC No. EJ 235 491.)

Appendix

Exemplary Field Experience Programs

This section describes some exemplary field experience programs in North America. Each program has at least one of the features recommended in the text of the monograph. This list is not exhaustive; its purpose is to provide a sampling of exemplary programs. Programs for which a source is not cited were finalists for the Association of Teacher Educators' "Distinguished Program in Teacher Education" awards between 1975 and 1982. Readers should contact the institutions for information.

Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

The Department of Elementary Education at Arizona State University conducts cooperative, teacher education field programs in four school districts in the Phoenix area. This program offers professional courses in the district centers rather than on campus. Interns take these courses concurrently with work in the schools.

Phases one and two of the program occur during the fall and spring semesters of the junior year. In all, the student works a minimum of 10 hours per week in the classroom for 32 weeks and takes 30 to 36 credit hours of on-site classes. Students work with children individually and in large groups. With teachers' guidance, they plan lessons and evaluate pupils. Students are encouraged to experience different grade levels, multiethnic classes, and open and self-contained class-management systems.

In phase three, the student teaches at least 40 hours per week for 16 weeks, supervised by clinical faculty. The intern shoulders more responsibility for instructional decisions, planning, and evaluation than in earlier phases. The cooperating teacher introduces the student teacher to these responsibilities gradually.

Phase four is optional, depending on whether the school has funds to pay the intern. In this phase, the intern participates in making decisions, planning, and evaluating as part of a teaching team. He or she works in classrooms a minimum of 20 hours per week for 16 weeks while completing professional course work on campus.

Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

In cooperation with the Alabama State Department of Education and 10

eastern Alabama school districts, Auburn University developed a program that emphasizes helping first-year teachers adjust to full-time teaching. First Year Teacher Support Teams combine the expertise of an experienced cooperating teacher, the school principal, a state Department of Education specialist, and a clinical professor from Auburn University. Upon request from the first-year teacher, these resource persons assist the teacher individually, in groups, or as a full committee.

Three significant characteristics of Auburn's program are (1) the governing board, composed of the chief administrators of participating agencies, (2) a unified budget, with funds contributed by participating agencies, and (3) sharing of resources by participating agencies.

(Mayfield, J. Robert, and Krajewski, Robert J.. "Erasing the Pre-Service/In-Service Dichotomy." Action in Teacher Education 1, 1 (Summer 1978):54-7. ERIC No. EJ 189 538.)

Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Brigham Young University's early field experience program in secondary teacher education evolved on the theory that students learn more by teaching in actual rather than simulated classroom settings. In the BYU model, the preservice teacher shares decision making with school and university personnel. Students have ample opportunity for reflection upon and interpretation of their experiences in the field.

During the first week of class in Secondary Education 276, groups of students are placed in junior or senior high school classrooms to teach and observe. Informed a day or two beforehand of the topics for that week, the students arrive prepared to teach short lessons. Often the students teach small groups of pupils in rotation. Sometimes a student teaches part of a lesson to the entire class for 10 to 15 minutes, then another student teaches the remainder of the lesson. The students also receive intensive instruction in reading and tutor secondary students with reading difficulties.

An interesting feature of the BYU program is the teacher exchange: BYU students and their university instructors take over certain teachers' classes for a day or longer. Meanwhile, the teachers may teach BYU secondary education classes, supervise student teachers for the university, or attend professional conferences.

(Baird, Hugh et al. "Helping Prospective Secondary Teachers be Outstanding in Their Field." Action in Teacher Education 1, 1 (Summer 1978):44-8. ERIC No. EJ 189 536.)

Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Michigan State University and the Lansing School District's competency-based teacher education program represents an alternative to traditional student teaching. The program rests upon two premises: (1) that basic teaching skills are generic, not content-bound, and (2) that a competency-based program needs a strong field component.

During the first term of the program, students complete as many objectives as possible, either in the on-campus laboratory or in a cooperating school under the supervision of a clinical instructor. Field work during this

term involves one-half day a week in cooperating schools, during which the students tutor small groups, and teach lessons or help teach lessons to the full class. The primary focus, however, is on the accomplishment of objectives that help the student learn skills to be assessed later.

During the second term, the student gradually assumes responsibility for a full day of teaching. Students receive feedback from peers as well as from pairs of clinical instructors. At the end of the program, students must demonstrate mastery of 14 identified teaching skills.

North Texas State University
Denton, Texas

North Texas State University offers numerous field experiences in each phase of teacher education. The experiences help students from the freshman year through the graduate level determine their affinity for teaching.

The program stresses pre-student teaching field experiences and encourages discussion of these experiences in the university classroom. Students take the first education course as freshmen, the remainder as juniors and seniors. All courses include some form of field experience. The most extensive field work occurs as part of "Laboratory Experiences in the Elementary School" (requiring at least 60 hours in the field) and "The American Secondary School" (requiring at least 30 hours in the field).

Student teaching culminates students' undergraduate preparation. Elementary student teaching is part of a block of three courses. Elementary student teachers take all three courses on campus during the first part of the semester from the same instructor, then teach during the second part of the semester under that instructor's supervision. Secondary student teaching is offered for eight weeks during the first or second half of the semester but does not accompany a block of courses.

Field experience in the master's and doctoral programs consists of practica or internships, as is common in such programs. In general, these experiences involve 120 to 240 hours, in which graduate students pursue advanced projects in their fields under the auspices of a university instructor.

(Williamson, John A. A Field-Based Teacher Education Program: From Neophyte to Accomplished Professional. 1979. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 284.)

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

The elementary education program at Northern Illinois University is organized as a block program: Students enroll in blocks of courses for certain blocks of time. One professor assumes responsibility for students enrolled in a particular block during each of the three professional semesters. Special features of the program include: (1) all-day participation in one of three participating schools (this lasts four weeks for sophomores; six weeks for juniors; 12 weeks for seniors); (2) field trips for students at each level; (3) student participation in policy and decisions regarding their classroom experiences; (4) student self-evaluation, individual conferences, and conferences within the clinical setting involving student, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor; (5) regularly scheduled

seminars in the participating schools, and (6) designation of one professor to instruct, advise, and supervise students in their blocks of courses.

The first professional semester emphasizes self-knowledge. Students read widely from books espousing a humanistic view of education, helping them examine ways of relating to children. Clinical experiences at this level stress relationships with children.

At the junior level, students concentrate on developing a "teacher self." They develop skills in mediating learning while continuing to work toward effective relationships with children and sharpening their awareness of the teacher's role as diagnostician. Students participate full time in a public school for six weeks, after which most are gradually inducted into teaching.

Seniors take intensive, two-week, university seminars on issues and problems related to the classroom, work in schools for 12 weeks, then spend a week at Lorado Taft Field Campus directing outdoor educational activities.

San Diego State University
San Diego, California

San Diego State University has developed a competency-based program in elementary education. The program seeks to guide preservice teachers toward mastery of sets of teaching skills presented in sequence. Modules or learning packages allow students to move through the sequence at their own pace.

San Diego's system includes 28 modules in the fall semester; 15 in the spring. Each student is assigned to a classroom; and his or her performance is evaluated by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor for mastery of the skills taught in each module. Seminars each semester provide continuity and opportunities for discussion with peers and instructors.

Evaluation of full-time student teaching relates closely to the modules. During the first semester's field experience, each student is evaluated on the ability to apply previously developed skills to interactions with children. During the second semester, students and cooperating teachers identify objectives that the students will try to accomplish in the classroom. The student negotiates a contract with the cooperating teacher and university supervisor that specifies desired consequences of working with children. The final evaluation is based on the student's demonstrated effectiveness in fulfilling this contract.

Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Southern University operates a competency/performance-based student teaching program. The College of Education identified 14 skills cited most often in the professional literature, restated each skill in performance terms, and developed a module for each skill. Each module, a self-contained unit outlining activities designed to build skills, gives students a sense of purpose and direction.

In this program, evaluation is based upon the extent to which the student teacher achieves objectives. A rating scale is used, specifying 14 skills and behaviors that indicate mastery of those skills. Students are rated by themselves, by their cooperating teachers, and by clinical professors on a continuum from 1 (poor) to 5 (superior). A traditional grade of A, B, C, D, or F is assigned, as determined by the rating average.

(Sims, Earline M. Competency/Performance-Based Student Teaching Program. October 1977. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 951.)

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale organizes its field program according to the teaching center model. Groups of students are assigned to certain school districts for all of their field work. A clinical professor based in the school system holds responsibility for administrative functions of the center and for the observation and evaluation of students. All student teachers meet weekly for seminars conducted by the clinical professor. In addition, each clinical professor periodically offers graduate courses in instructional supervision for the center's cooperating teachers.

The field sequence begins with a one-semester, half-day-per-week, observation-and-participation experience in public schools. An integral segment of the "Basic Techniques and Procedures in Instruction" course, this experience exposes the student to appropriate professional behavior and a variety of teaching methods. In addition, it introduces the student to teaching individuals and small groups. (Normally, the preservice student returns to this classroom for student teaching.)

The second semester of this sequence, similar in structure to the first, places the student at a different grade level. Emphasis falls on planning short- and long-range lessons and on teaching these to small and large groups.

Student teaching at SIU-C occupies a full semester and includes a seminar that encourages students to reflect upon their experiences. The semester stresses diagnosis, planning, implementation, and evaluation of teaching with eventual assumption of full responsibility in the classroom.

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Syracuse University's field program operates on the teaching center concept. The School of Education holds consortia agreements with two suburban school districts and one urban school district. Each center is governed by a council of university and public school personnel; a coordinator performs administrative duties and implements the preservice and inservice programs.

During the first semester of the preservice program, the student spends two days of every week in a public school and three on campus. Campus courses are linked to field experiences. During the second semester, the student spends three days of every week in school and two days on campus. Students enroll in content-methods courses and apply these methods in the classroom. The student teaching semester consists of full-time, public school teaching. Normally, the student spends half the semester in a primary classroom and the other half in an intermediate class. Many students further broaden their experience by teaching in each of the cooperating centers.

The collaborative nature of the Syracuse program is reflected in the joint development by public school and university personnel of the content and generic skills to be mastered by the student. In addition, the university develops inservice courses to meet the needs of public school teachers and administrators and offers them in the teaching center. Cooperating teachers often receive training in the teaching models taught to preservice students.

Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey

Trenton's preservice program stresses eight generic teaching skills revealed by an analysis of the role of the teacher. The program includes early exposure to professional education and correlates field experiences with education courses. Each course involves some field work in which students experience the practical application of theoretical constructs.

Students acquire and demonstrate proficiency in the required skills through modular, individually paced instruction. The modules eventually lead to teaching in a public school classroom. The student first teaches a lesson before a videotape camera. Next, the student teaches the lesson in the public school and receives a critique by the cooperating teacher. Oral and written tests further probe the student's skill. On the basis of the lesson and test results, the student either repeats the module or goes on to the next. Students who cannot demonstrate proficiency at the end of the program are not recommended for certification.

Freshmen elementary majors enroll in an introductory education course with visits to local schools. Sophomores enroll in a 17-semester-hour field study in an urban school during which they work with education professors and classroom teachers as a team. The students spend four mornings a week in the school and three afternoons on campus. Activities include observing teacher and pupil performance, leading group discussions, and exploring relationships between the community and school.

The junior field experience is a 16-semester-hour block in an elementary school. Professors and students report to the school where all instruction takes place; no courses are scheduled on campus. The emphasis is on planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction. The students' classroom performance is videotaped at least 20 times during the semester.

The senior field experience, a 12-semester-hour block, emphasizes diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties and the integration of learned techniques into complex teaching strategies.

Union University
Jackson, Tennessee

The Early Bird Internship Program in Teacher Education at Union University offers sophomores an introduction to public schools prior to the senior student teaching requirement. In partial fulfillment of the requirements for a beginning education course that all prospective teachers take near the end of the sophomore year, the student spends a 20-hour internship in a local elementary or secondary school. During the internship, students experience the many complex operations of elementary and secondary schools by working in the principal's and counselors' offices, assisting classroom teachers, working with student government and parent-teacher groups, and participating in other school activities. Interns keep an hourly log of their activities and experiences. At the conclusion of this program, the principal of the school to which the student is assigned and the university instructor jointly evaluate the student's internship.

(The Union University "Early Bird" Internship Program in Teacher Education. Jackson, Tenn.: Union University, 1975. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 095.)

University of North Alabama
Florence, Alabama

The secondary education faculty of the University of North Alabama and five public school systems in the Muscle Shoals area have developed a consortium for the purpose of developing, implementing, and evaluating students' campus learning experiences and clinical work in local schools.

As sophomores, secondary education students begin clinical observation in conjunction with professional education courses. During the junior year, students observe, tutor, and teach small groups, again in conjunction with campus courses. Senior secondary majors enroll in eight weeks of courses under the tutelage of faculty members who also coordinate the final nine weeks of student teaching.

The key to the University of North Alabama's program is the cooperation of university and school personnel. All aspects of the program, including placement and orientation procedures, supervision techniques, and evaluation criteria and methods are developed jointly.

University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Oregon's Resident Teacher Master's Degree Program combines graduate study with a year of full-time teaching in a public school in an induction program for first-year teachers. All resident teachers under contract with participating school districts enroll as graduate students for four terms. Required courses are taught in the schools.

During the year, resident teachers fulfill practicum assignments related to course work and participate in weekly seminars. Each seminar includes approximately 15 resident teachers from each district or neighboring districts. Often, the teachers in each seminar form a support group.

A supervisor in each school assists resident teachers with orientation and confers in planning sessions throughout the year. Sometimes, the supervisor demonstrates lessons, team teaches, or teaches the class for the resident to observe. In addition, the supervisor, often working with the clinical professor and/or principal, confers with the resident regarding teaching performance. This program assures resident teachers that their performance will be monitored closely and effectively.

University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

The University of Ottawa offers an alternative approach to the preservice training of teachers: a humanistic program based on the work of Dr. Arthur Combs. The following structures, deemed central to the innovative quality of the program, encourage relationships between university faculty and students.

The counseling group. For approximately six hours per week, eight to 15 students and a professor explore the significance of ideas and experiences, receive counseling and support, and plan future learning activities.

The team meeting. Faculty members and one representative from each counseling group meet to plan weekly teaching activities.

The community session. Students and faculty meet weekly to share concerns, problems, insights, etc., resulting from their experiences in the public schools.

At the beginning of the program, faculty members present orientation sessions in which students are introduced to the major areas of study. Over the next four months, students spend three, 10-day periods in field study in local schools, exploring ways of helping others learn. Gradually, at a rate commensurate with his or her rate of growth, the student assumes responsibility for teaching an entire class. During the winter semester, students take eight weeks of practical field experience evaluated formally by associate teachers.

Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas

The College of Education at Wichita State University, in cooperation with the Wichita Public Schools, offers a program of introductory education courses that is completely field based. Teams of instructors include both public school and university personnel. Funded entirely by Wichita State University, the program embraces both elementary and secondary education. Students enroll in three beginning courses in professional education (offered in the schools) that are linked to field activities. Serving as a teacher aide, helping with school activities, observing unique educational programs or interviewing specialists, participating in community activities, and actually teaching in some classrooms help students draw connections between theory and practice.

(A Field-Based Approach to Introductory Education Courses. Wichita, Kansas: Wichita State University, College of Education, November 1973. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 085 379.)

Wisconsin Improvement Program
Madison, Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Improvement Program involves the cooperation of colleges, universities, school systems, and the state Department of Public Instruction. The universities provide academic and professional preparation; the schools provide a dynamic setting for field learning. Personnel from the universities and the schools share responsibility for supervising the interns. The state Department of Public Instruction is the agency which licenses interns. By stressing cooperation, the program encourages school administrators, teachers, and boards of education to recognize their vital roles in providing the best practical experiences for teachers-in-training.

Wisconsin's internship is a salaried, licensed, full-semester teaching assignment in a school system. In this arrangement, one or more promising candidates teach as part of a team under the daily supervision of one or more experienced teachers. Interns participate as members of a professional team, helping with planning and programming for classroom instruction, as well as other responsibilities.

(The Wisconsin Improvement Program and the Teacher Internship. Madison, Wis.: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, September 1973. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 086 689.)